U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Technical Information Service

CMP-SPRCM-76-19

SELECTIONS FROM PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA MAGAZINES

U.S
AMERICAN CONSULAGE GENERAL
HONG KONG, B.C.C.

JULY 1976

U. I. C. C.
SEP 9 1976
LIBRARY

KEEP UP TO DATE

Between the time you ordered this report—which is only one of the hundreds of thousands in the NTIS information collection available to you—and the time you are reading this message, several *new* reports relevant to your interests probably have entered the collection.

Subscribe to the **Weekly Government Abstracts** series that will bring you summaries of new reports *as soon as they are received by NTIS* from the originators of the research. The WGA's are an NTIS weekly newsletter service covering the most recent research findings in 25 areas of industrial, technological, and sociological interest—invaluable information for executives and professionals who must keep up to date.

The executive and professional information service provided by NTIS in the **Weekly Government Abstracts** newsletters will give you thorough and comprehensive coverage of government-conducted or sponsored research activities. And you'll get this important information within two weeks of the time it's released by originating agencies.

WGA newsletters are computer produced and electronically photocomposed to slash the time gap between the release of a report and its availability. You can learn about technical innovations immediately—and use them in the most meaningful and productive ways possible for your organization. Please request NTIS-PR-205/PCW for more information.

The weekly newsletter series will keep you current. But *learn what you have missed in the past* by ordering a computer **NTISearch** of all the research reports in your area of interest, dating as far back as 1964, if you wish. Please request NTIS-PR-186/PCN for more information.

WRITE: Managing Editor
5285 Port Royal Road
Springfield, VA 22161

Keep Up To Date With SRIM

SRIM (Selected Research in Microfiche) provides you with regular, automatic distribution of the complete texts of NTIS research reports *only* in the subject areas you select. SRIM covers almost all Government research reports by subject area and/or the originating Federal or local government agency. You may subscribe by any category or subcategory of our WGA **(Weekly Government Abstracts)** or **Government Reports Announcements and Index** categories, or to the reports issued by a particular agency such as the Department of Defense, Federal Energy Administration, or Environmental Protection Agency. Other options that will give you greater selectivity are available on request.

The cost of SRIM service is only 45¢ domestic (60¢ foreign) for each complete microfiched report. Your SRIM service begins as soon as your order is received and processed and you will receive biweekly shipments thereafter. If you wish, your service will be backdated to furnish you microfiche of reports issued earlier.

Because of contractual arrangements with several Special Technology Groups, not all NTIS reports are distributed in the SRIM program. You will receive a notice in your microfiche shipments identifying the exceptionally priced reports not available through SRIM.

A deposit account with NTIS is required before this service can be initiated. If you have specific questions concerning this service, please call (703) 451-1558, or write NTIS, attention SRIM Product Manager.

This information product distributed by

NTIS U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Technical Information Service
5285 Port Royal Road
Springfield, Virginia 22161

CMP-SPRCM-76-19

中华人民共和国杂誌选译

Selections from People's Republic of China Magazines

American Consulate General
Hong Kong

No. 878
July 6, 1976

This edition is printed in the United States of America for dissemination in the Western Hemisphere, Europe, the Mediterranean, and the west coast of Africa from material produced by the American Consulate General, Hong Kong. All queries concerning this edition should be sent to:

National Technical Information
Service (152.12)
U.S. Department of Commerce
Springfield, Virginia 22151

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

(Historical Research)

"The Rule of Wen and Ching"--a Definition - by K'ang Min 1

Class Struggle Is the Key Link, Everything Else Hinges on It - by Chin Nan 8

"Masterpiece" of Hegemonism - Comment on China's Modern History published in Moscow - by Wu Yin-nien 16

Tsarist Russia's Aggressive Expansion Against the Balkans - by Shih Ping and Pao Pin 33

* * *

REPRODUCED BY
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

PRICES SUBJECT TO CHANGE

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2023

https://archive.org/details/selections-from-prc-magazines_1976-07_19

"The Rule of Wen and Ching" -- A Definition

by

K'ang Min (康 民), Nanking Normal College

(Li-shih Yen-chiu /Historical Research/, No. 2, April 20, 1976)

The nearly four decades (180-141 B.C.) of rule by Emperor Wen, Liu Heng, and Emperor Ching, Liu Ch'i, of the Han Dynasty in Chinese history was a period marked by increasing political unity and stability and development of the feudal economy over the breadth and length of the country. How did this situation come about? The Confucian scholar Pan Ku said: Han Emperor Wen "achieved economic prosperity and moral regeneration by his efforts to indoctrinate the people with morality and virtues. Hundreds of prisons were closed and capital punishment was rarely applied. What a wonder wrought by benevolence!" ("In Praise of Emperor Wen," History of Han) Emperor Ching "followed suit." "The era of Wen and Ching of Han was a beautiful era!" ("In Praise of Emperor Ching," History of Han) These views were written into historical annals and over the ages followers of Confucius and Mencius, playing parrots, claimed that "the rule of Wen and Ching" was the "rule of benevolence," the "rule of virtue." Therefore, "peace" prevailed under heaven during the periods of Wen and Ching. Are the historical facts really so? This question deserves to be debated and made clear.

The metabolic process of social system is invariably accompanied by repeated trials of strength between classes. In the course of supersession of the slave system by the feudal system in Chinese history, the declining slave-owner forces and the newly emerging landlord class carried out a prolonged struggle against each other, a struggle between restoration and counter-restoration. After the newly emerging landlord class seized political power and became the ruling class, a vital aspect of this struggle was this: One side created trouble to undermine unity and stability; the other side opposed the attempt to create trouble and strove for unity and stability. Such a struggle existed in the Ch'in Dynasty and did not vanish by the Han. Indeed, in early Han rebellious forces "rose everywhere" ("Chia I," History of Han) and "people unscrupulously chased after wealth" ("P'inghuai Letter," Historical Records) and engaged in market speculations. These constituted serious restorationist and disruptive activities. Liu Pang, representative of the newly emerging landlord class, pushed a Legalist line, ruthlessly suppressed Han Hsin and other princes who were not members of the Liu clan, and tried by a thousand and one means to curtail the slave-owner forces in industry and commerce; these were activities to oppose restoration and sabotage. Thus the common people were relieved of "the sufferings that were endured during the Warring States period." Although the historical account that this was a period of "perfect order under heaven," a period where "the people devoted themselves to farming and food and clothing were abundant" ("Empress Lü," Historical Records) was somewhat exaggerated, the fact remained that the newly emerging landlord class through its struggle indeed achieved a phase of relative unity and stability.

Relative stability in society does not mean universal peace under heaven. The periods of Wen and Ching were periods of relative stability, but peace did not prevail under heaven. Class struggle still existed and restorationist forces were still rampant. "Men of means" bought and sold slaves and ran handicrafts and commerce in the form of the slave system. They "colluded with princes" in doing harm to the people and the state. As a result, the common people and the state were "impoverished." ("Kuei Wei," New Books) These provided fertile soil for restoration. Meanwhile, the Hun slave-owning nobles in the northern parts of our country carried out "harassment and plunder" against the Han Dynasty. ("Chia I," History of Han) They carried out intermittant raids and kidnapped people to be slaves while attempting to expand their territory. Even more noteworthy, separatist forces represented by the princes of the Liu clan were viciously expanding. They occupied large tracts of land and controlled the political, economic and military power in their fiefs. Not only did they want to preserve the vested interests, but they wanted to advance a foot after gaining an inch, wantonly colluded with slave-owner forces in industry and commerce, recruited Confucians, contended for fame and wealth, and even collaborated with Hun slave-owning nobles in creating disturbances. Some social scum and degenerates leaned to and supported them. These people who were originally members of the landlord class pushed a Confucian restorationist line and in fact had become representatives of the restorationist forces. Liu Hsing-chü, Prince of Chipei, Liu Ch'ang, Prince of Huainan, Li Pi, Prince of Wu, and others opposed the Han Central Administration and rose in revolt one after another. Moreover, they had the support of the Hun slave-owning nobles who sent troops to help them, the support of the Confucian and Mencian disciples such as Yüan Ang who rallied public opinion behind them, and the support of the slave-owner forces in industry and commerce who made financial contributions to them. In addition, "elder statesmen in various regions" ("Biographies of Yüan Ang and Ch'ao Ts'o," Historical Records) and other hermits and people living in obscurity threw their hats into the air and applauded their action. These were obvious historical facts.

As clouds of war were gathering, this illustrated that a serious class struggle existed, that separatist forces existed under conditions of unity, and there were factors of instability in a phase of stability. How such a situation should be viewed and what attitude should be adopted toward it involved the question of political principle related to the line. There were at that time two diametrically conflicting views and attitudes. Some, contented with the status quo, were apathetic and even said that with "peace and order prevailing under health" ("Chia I," History of Han) one could go to sleep without worry. They opposed the Legalist line and the policy of the Han imperial court to "reduce the lands of the princes." Others disagreed and pointed out that there was only "temporary peace" (Ibid.) as there were still hidden troubles. They maintained that the danger could be averted and security assured only when the Legalist line was implemented and "the lands of the princes are reduced." This was the ideological difference and struggle in line between the Confucian and Legalist schools, one for restoration and the other against restoration. This struggle was very acute. No sooner had the young Legalist Chia I proposed

a number of reforms than he was opposed and denounced as "a young man who was just beginning to learn but who wanted to gain power and make trouble." (Ibid.) Consequently, he was dismissed from the Han Central Government. But did those who opposed reform really want "stability"? No. After the new force Chia I was repressed and the Han Central Government temporarily dropped reform, did struggle cease? It did not. Only three years after Emperor Wen ascended the throne, the reactionaries struck. The Hun slave-owning nobles led an army "into the north and carried out plunder in Honan." ("Emperor Wen," History of Han) Liu Hsing-chü, Prince of Chipei, "rebelled," "despatched his troops for an attack against Yingyang" (Ibid.) and sprang a surprise raid on the Han Dynasty. Emperor Wen promptly launched a counter-attack and quelled the uprisings. Another three years passed. Liu Ch'ang, Prince of Huainan, who "disobeyed orders on several occasions," collaborated with the Huns and was intent on "rebellion." Naturally, Emperor Wen suppressed him as well. At this time, people with ulterior motives could not restrain themselves any more and started to create reactionary public opinion. In streets and lanes they spread rumors, saying: "You can still sew with one yard of cloth and grind with one peck of grain. But the two brothers cannot tolerate each other!" ("Huainan and Hengshan," Historical Records) By castigating Emperor Wen for suppressing his younger blood brother, Liu Ch'ang, they wanted to confound wrong with right and stab people in the back. Liu Pi, Prince of Wu, who "failed to observe the propriety of a prince" ("Liu Pi, Prince of Wu," Historical Records) opposed the Han Central Government, being at the height of his reactionary arrogance. But not only was he not condemned, he was even encouraged to go further. For instance, men like Yüan Ang accepted his bribes and rallied support behind him. When the Legalist Ch'ao Ts'o recommended to Emperor Ching "reducing the lands of the princes," Yüan Ang assisted Liu Pi in playing the reactionary tactics of "purifying the ranks around the emperor," causing the death of Ch'ao Ts'o (see "Yüan Ang and Ch'ao Ts'o," Historical Records), madly persecuting the Legalist bloc and vainly attempting to topple the Han Dynasty. Such blood-thirsty acts signified the living class struggle, the struggle between the Confucian and Legalist lines.

Frenzied offensives by the restorationist forces compelled the newly emerging landlord class to face the reality squarely and recognize the current struggle. Emperor Wen, who once "dismissed" Chia I, "recalled I" and "repeatedly asked him for advice." Confronted with the reality, Chia I submitted his "Policy on Order and Security," which, as its main thrust, called for "increasing the number of princes and reducing their power," giving priority to agriculture, restricting commerce and resisting the Huns. He benefited by the useful ingredients of the Legalist theories that emerged since the pre-Ch'in period and dropped the negative aspect of the idea of "inactivity" of Huang Ti and Lao Tzu in early Han. He pointed out: We must not remain "inactive" and "do nothing" because there was "temporary peace under heaven," otherwise, the consequences could be unthinkable. Citing the saying that "when the sun is over our heads, it is the best time to dry our clothes; when knives are in our hands, it is the best time to cut crops," he emphasized the need to adopt early and effective measures within the bounds of the rule of law on the strength of the increasingly consolidated central political structure so that the Han Dynasty might "build permanent

peace and establish permanent order." ("Chia I," History of Han) Ch'ao Ts'o more than once suggested to Emperor Wen that "the border defenses be strengthened" and "the economic foundation of the country be made more solid by developing agriculture." He stressed the need to "reduce the lands of the princes" and "institute laws." ("Yuan Ang and Ch'ao Ts'o," History of Han) Emperor Wen highly appreciated their opinions. Emperor Ching made even greater use of Ch'ao Ts'o, commissioning him to formulate a concrete plan for "reducing the lands of the princes." Class struggle is an undeniably cruel reality, and it can make the minds of some people sober. Although the Legalists such as Chia I and Ch'ao Ts'o were unable consciously to understand and master the laws of class struggle, nevertheless they represented newly emerging forces and had the spirit of facing the reality squarely and daring to struggle. Therefore, in the course of class struggle they were able to discern some concrete issues of struggle and plunged into the struggle. It was by no means accidental that representatives of the newly emerging landlord class like Emperors Wen and Ching adopted the Legalist line because this was determined by their class stand, by the vigor and vitality of their class in its period of ascendance.

Only when a distinction is made between right and wrong ideologically will there be a criterion for action. It was precisely because during the Wen-Ching periods the Legalist leadership group comprising men like Emperor Wen, Emperor Ching, Chia I and Ch'ao Ts'o gradually clarified the important issues pertaining to order and disorder, security and danger that a correct ideological orientation was provided for the struggle against restoration and it was possible to assure that the goal of unity and stability would not deviate from the key link, the struggle against restoration.

First of all, they upheld the Legalist lines practiced by Ch'in Shih Huang and Liu Pang, and did not permit anyone to create trouble and distort and alter these lines on any excuse. "Upholding" had a great bearing because, following the death in succession of Liu Pang, Hsiao Ho, and Empress Lü, the strength of the Legalist leadership group of the Western Han Central Government was somewhat weakened, while the Legalists Chia I, Ch'ao Ts'o and other members of the new force were maturing. This was an important period for the succession of the new to the old within the Legalist leadership group. At this time,if the dominating position within the central government of the Legalist linewas not secure, the door would be flung open for a handful of careerists to usurp power. "Han taking over the Ch'in system" would be changed into "Han restoring Chou's system." In this struggle between the Confucian and Legalist schools, Ch'in Shih Huang and Liu Pang were like two daggers in the hands of the Legalists at that time, with the restorationist forces doing their utmost to negate these two daggers. In view of this, Ch'ao Ts'o took the view: Ch'in Shih Huang "was able to annex the six states and establish himself as the son of heaven," but "was unable to go further than the earlier Three Kings." The collapse of the Ch'in Dynasty after the second emperor ascended the throne was not the fault of Ch'in Shih Huang, but due to the benightedness of Hu Hai, who "employed treacherous ministers and believed traitors." He allowed traitor Chao Kao to do whatever he pleased and abandoned the laws of Ch'in Shih Huang. This caused the

chaotic situation in which "officials felt suppressed, policies were not executed, and the people were restless." ("Yüan Ang and Ch'ao Ts'o," History of Han) Ch'ao Ts'o's analysis refuted the reactionary Confucian scholars' charge that "the collapse of Ch'in was caused by the Legalists" and pronounced the rationality of "Han taking over Ch'in's system." As for Liu Pang who rose after Ch'in Shih Huang, they followed the example he set and carried on the cause he established, basically acting according to his Legalist line. By doing so, they grasped the basic issues of "order" and "peace," preserved the preponderance of the Legalist line in the Western Han Central Government, and prevented the interference by the restorationist Confucian line.

They firmly carried out the struggle against restoration, resorting to violence in reducing the lands of the princes and seeking unity and stability by means of struggle. In early Han, Liu Pang, Empress Lü and others spared no effort in quelling the rebellions of the princes who were not members of the Liu clan. Faced with the increasingly rampant separatist and restorationist forces of the princes of the Liu clan, Emperor Wen shrewdly adapted to changing circumstances. Applying both the carrot and the stick, conserving his strength and taking defense for offense, he firmly grasped the "power, the prevailing situation, and the laws," and sharpened "the axe of the sovereign of the people." It was precisely by sharpening this "axe" and making skilful use of it that Emperor Ching was able to reduce the lands of the princes and in a matter of three months quelled the rebellions of the seven princes, including Wu and Ch'u. Moreover, it was on this basis that the Han imperial court further curtailed the political power of the princes, causing the restorationist forces to decline and the dictatorship of the newly emerging landlord class to be increasingly consolidated.

The anti-restoration struggle had to be carried out not only in the political arena but also in the economic field. In early Han the newly emerging landlord class "gave priority to agriculture and restrained commerce." With the political power gained, Liu Pang and Empress Lü struck at the slave-owner forces in industry and commerce while consolidating and developing the new relations of production. But the slave-owner forces in industry and commerce were still around and Liu Pi, Prince of Wu, and other representatives of the restorationist forces still showed an interest in them, trafficking in slaves and exploiting the people in the form of the decadent slave system. These were at that time the basis and material conditions for restoration. When starting the rebellion, Liu Pi voluntarily admitted: "I.....reserved money, prepared arms and accumulated grain for thirty years and more without a break." "I have funds not only in Wu but all over the empire, an inexhaustible supply even if the princes draw on it day and night." ("Liu Pi, Prince of Wu," Historical Records) It was quite obvious that when Liu Pi was trying so hard all these years to mint money and extract salt from the sea, his intention was not to develop the social productive forces nor to improve the living standards of the common people, but entirely to serve his restorationist program of "preserving the descendants of the dead, protecting the weak and fighting against tyranny." (Ibid.) Emperors Wen and Ching both took "agriculture as the

foundation of the empire." ("Chronicles of Emperor Wen" and "Chronicles of Emperor Ching," History of Han) They devoted their energies to developing the feudal agricultural economy and reduced agricultural taxes to an appropriate degree in order to facilitate the development of the landlord economy. Chia I, Ch'ao Ts'o and others also stressed the need to "restrain commerce," believing that only by so doing was it possible to assure "giving priority to agriculture." As it was stated in historical annals, when the Han Dynasty was first founded, "the Son of Heaven had no complete horse carriages, generals and ministers rode in ox-drawn carts, and the people had no reserve grain." Both the state and the common people were very poor. However, by the first year of Emperor Wu, "the state granaries were full of grain and the state treasury had vast monetary reserves" and "the people were adequately fed and clothed." ("P'inghuai Letter," Historical Records) As the state became rich, the landlord economy was also developed. What caused these changes? The most important reason was that through the "rule of Wen and Ching," the struggle against restoration carried out in the political and economic spheres paved the way and offered favorable conditions for the development of the feudal economy. By the era of Emperor Wu, still greater efforts were made to introduce such measures as state ownership of the salt and iron industries, bringing tax evaders to justice, rewarding those who reported tax evasions, keeping food prices low and supplying grain deficient areas with grain from surplus areas. These made it possible to break all sorts of resistance from the restorationist forces in the economic field, basically eliminate the economic foundation for the restoration of the slave system, consolidate the feudal relations of production and promote further development of the feudal economy.

During the periods of Wen and Ching, in view of the harassments carried out by the Hun slave-owning nobles, counter-policies of strengthening the preparedness against war and actively stepping up defenses were adopted. In early Han efforts were made to reach "rapport" with the Hun slave-owning nobles in hopes of bringing about peaceful co-existence. But "the Huns not only refused to stop their gangster acts but became even more arrogant." Emperor Wen at first "opened up trade with them, gave them Han girls as wives, increased his bribes to them to the extent of a thousand ounces of gold annually" with the hope that the Hun slave-owning nobles would talk about faith and justice and stop their military moves. "But the Huns went back to their words again and again," and the Han Dynasty "repeatedly suffered the evil consequences." The perfidious, despicable acts of the Hun slave-owning nobles educated Emperor Wen by negative example. "Extremely angry," Emperor Wen, now in his thirties, personally attended to the preparations for war and "raised a fine army in the empire" ("The Huns," History of Han), actively preparing defenses against the intruders. This, to a certain extent, dealt a blow to the Hun slave-owning nobles carrying out the harassments, broke their ties with Liu Pi and other restorationist forces, and insured the victorious conduct of the anti-restorationist struggle in the political and economic spheres. By the time of Emperor Wu, under conditions of growing economic and military strength and on the basis of decisive victories won in the political struggle against restoration, large-scale expeditionary forces were despatched against the Huns and tremendous victories were won. This made for greater unity and stability of the Han empire and the development of the feudal economy in a more favorable direction.

The basic contradictions in feudal society were those between the peasantry and the landlord class. The basic content of the "rule" of Wen and Ching consisted of the rule of the landlord class over the peasantry and of economic exploitation and political oppression of the latter by the former. But in these periods these basic contradictions were not intensified nor developed to the form of large-scale external confrontation.

It is clear from the historical perspective that the unity and stability as well as economic development in the periods of Wen and Ching had class content and were products of class struggle. The so-called "rule of Wen and Ching" was definitely not "rule of benevolence" or "rule of virtue," but the dictatorship of the newly emerging landlord class. By describing the "rule of Wen and Ching" as the "rule of benevolence," the followers of Confucius and Mencius distorted and reversed history. Actually, they adhered to Confucius' tenet "Restraining oneself and returning to propriety is benevolence." With the despicable tricks of reversing history, they engaged exclusively in the dirty deals of promoting restoration. Ssuma Kuang said that Emperor Wen "indoctrinated his people with virtue" with "a devotion unsurpassed in later generations." ("Chronicles of Han, Part VII," Tzu-chih T'ung-chien) A reactionary following the doctrines of Confucius and Mencius, he opposed Wang An-shih's reform. Following the doctrines of Confucius and Mencius, Liu Shao-ch'i and Lin Piao preached the theory of the dying out of class struggle and the theory of productive forces for the express purpose of restoring the older order. This is also true of Teng Hsiao-p'ing. In class society, politics means class struggle, and problems of stability as well as economic problems all are subordinated to politics. "Class struggle is the key link and everything else hinges on it." Today, we must resolutely take class struggle as the key link, implement the Party's basic line, penetratingly criticize the revisionist program of "taking the three directives as the key link," repulse the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts, and advance from victory to greater victory along Chairman Mao's revolutionary line.

* * *

Class Struggle Is the Key Link, Everything Else Hinges on It

by

Chin Nan (靳南)

(Li-shih Yen-chiu /Historical Research/, No. 2, April 20, 1976)

Embracing profound proletarian feeling for Chairman Mao and the Party Central Committee headed by him, we ardently cheer the decision of the Chinese Communist Party Central Committee concerning the appointment of Comrade Hua Kuo-feng to be the Party Central Committee's First Vice Chairman and the State Council's Premier, resolutely support the Chinese Communist Party Central Committee's decision to remove Teng Hsiao-p'ing from all duties inside and outside the Party and resolutely support the revolutionary action instituted by the dictatorship of the proletariat against the small group of class enemies who manufactured the Tienanmen Square counter-revolutionary political incident. We certainly must unite around the Party Central Committee led by Chairman Mao, take practical action to protect Chairman Mao and his proletarian revolutionary line, thoroughly criticize Teng Hsiao-p'ing's counter-revolutionary revisionist line and further heighten the conscious execution of Chairman Mao's revolutionary line.

Chairman Mao has pointed out: "What! 'Taking the three directives as the key link.' Stability and unity do not mean writing off class struggle. Class struggle is the key link and everything else hinges on it." This important directive of Chairman Mao's is a forceful and sharp criticism of "taking the three directives as the key link" which the unrepentant capitalist roader Teng Hsiao-p'ing advocated.

Taking class struggle as the key link is Chairman Mao's consistent ideology and the basic theory and practice of our Party led by Chairman Mao for the past more than 20 years in advancing the socialist revolution. Its theoretical basis is the Marxist theory that class struggle is the motive force for the development of class society and theory that the principal contradiction during the period of socialism is the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie.

In class society, all social contradictions are concisely manifested in class contradictions and can only be resolved by undergoing class struggle. "Revolution is the locomotive of history." Historical progress depends on revolution and on the class struggle of revolutionary classes overthrowing reactionary classes for impetus. Without revolution, without class struggle, there will be no historical progress.

Socialist society is one in which classes, class contradictions and class struggle still exist. The contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie is the principal contradiction in socialist

society. Two possibilities exist for the development of socialist society: either progressing toward communism or reverting to capitalism. Which possibility is finally realized depends completely on the development of this society's principal contradictions and on the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. If the proletariat wants to advance toward the realization of the development of communism and defend against the regression of capitalism, it must firmly grasp the initiative of class struggle in its own hand, carry out the class struggle against the bourgeoisie through to the end and smash all restorationist hopes and activities of the bourgeoisie. If the road of class struggle is not followed, what an absurd communism will be reached. It can only be false communism, only "Elfland's jeweled palaces" of the goulash type.

When criticizing Liu Shao-ch'i's revisionist line in 1965, Chairman Mao penetratingly pointed out: "Throughout a transitional period, class contradictions exist, class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie exists and the two-road struggle between socialism and capitalism exists. To forget this basic theory and basic practice of our Party these ten years or so will lead to taking the wrong road."

To deny taking class struggle as the key link is to withhold recognition to the principal contradiction of the socialist period and alter the Party's basic line during the whole historical period of socialism. Looking back on our Party's several major line struggles during the socialist revolution period, one can clearly see a basic theoretical discrepancy between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism on how to understand the principal contradictions in socialist society. After the socialist transformation of ownership of the means of production was basically completed, Liu Shao-ch'i nonsensically said: "The contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie has been fundamentally resolved," the principal domestic contradiction "is the contradiction between the advanced socialist system and backward social productive forces." In the midst of the urban and rural socialist education movement, he again nonsensically said the principal contradiction in the countryside was "the contradiction between four cleans and four non-uncleans," "the contradictions inside and outside the Party intersect," etc. The renegade and traitor Lin Piao teamed up with Ch'en Po-ta in drafting the political report for the Ninth Party Congress, and also contending that the principal task after the Congress was the development of production. They both denied that the principal contradiction of the socialist period was that between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie and so negated taking class struggle as the key link. This basic theoretical discrepancy was in practice directly manifested as a struggle over whether to uphold or negate the Party's basic line. This was precisely the essence of the intra-Party two-line struggle during the socialist period.

The unrepentant capitalist roader Teng Hsiao-p'ing threw out "taking the three directives as the key link," deviously and carefully yet precisely attempted to obliterate or distort the principal contradiction of our society and used the revisionist theory of the extinguishing of class struggle and theory of productive forces to take the place of the Marxist theory of class struggle. He put stability,

unity and the development of the national economy -- the sort of things which are subordinated to the main goal -- in the position of key link, saying that contradictions between stability and instability, unity and disunity as well as between backward education and scientific research and the four modernizations had all become principal contradictions. In addition, from this type of premise distorting the principal contradiction of society, he wholly negated and attacked the victorious results of the great proletarian cultural revolution and the movement to criticize Lin Piao and Confucius, made every effort to resist and destroy the movement to study the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat and to criticize Water Margin. This was done to negate the criticism of and struggle against revisionism and capitalism and to eliminate the Party's basic line once and for all. He also nonsensically said: "How is it possible to talk about class struggle every day?" as if class struggle had really been extinguished. This is a public betrayal of the basic line of the Party personally established by Chairman Mao. Chairman Mao recently pointed out: "In 1949 it was pointed out that the principal contradiction within the country was one between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. Thirteen years later, the question of class struggle was reiterated and mention was made to the fact that the situation had begun to turn for the better. What was the reason for the great cultural revolution? To wage class struggle. Liu Shao-ch'i advocated the theory of the dying out of class struggle, but he himself never ceased to wage class struggle. He wanted to protect his bunch of renegades and sworn followers. Lin Piao wanted to overthrow the proletariat and attempted a coup. Did class struggle die out?" Reality informs us that in the period of socialism, class struggle cannot be extinguished, and the counter-attack on the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts is a sharp, complicated class struggle. We must from the viewpoint of class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, analyze the class essence of various tendencies and slogans that come out in the course of movements. We "must not be so pedantic as to take an over-simplified view of complicated class struggle." The recent counter-revolutionary incident which occurred in Tienanmen Square of the capital is a manifestation of this kind of very much alive and frightening class struggle. It irrefutably confirms Chairman Mao's brilliant thesis that people who advocate the dying out of class struggle themselves do not want class struggle to "die out." They say this merely to paralyze the proletariat's revolutionary fighting spirit and to camouflage the attack by the bourgeoisie against the proletariat.

To deny that class struggle is the key link is to deny the entire dictatorship of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie. The dictatorship of the proletariat is class struggle in which the proletariat uses the state's political power to oppose the bourgeoisie. Lenin more than once pointed out, the dictatorship of the proletariat is not the end of class struggle, but the continuation of class struggle in new form. In 1959, on the strength of the experience of the struggle between our Party and P'eng Te-huai's anti-Party clique and the experience of having been through many struggles, Chairman Mao clearly pointed out: "In China and in our Party, this type of struggle is likely to go on, at least for 20 years, possibly for half a century. In short, only when classes have

been completely eliminated will struggle cease." The dictatorship of the proletariat is therefore necessary because classes and class struggle still exist. Deny the existence of class struggle and class struggle as the key link, and the inevitable result will be the same as the fallacy of the "state of the whole people" advocated by the Soviet revisionists, altering the essence of the dictatorship of the proletariat and basically betraying this dictatorship.

The spearhead of the unrepentant capitalist roader Teng Hsiao-p'ing who threw out "Taking the three directives as the key link" is aimed at the dictatorship of the proletariat. Before the great proletarian cultural revolution, he followed the path of Liu Shao-ch'i shouting "We have been through enough dictatorship, hereafter we can relax a little." The great proletarian cultural revolution runs completely counter to his heart's desire. The proletariat didn't "relax" its own dictatorship; instead, from the economic foundation to the superstructure, it consolidated and strengthened its all-round dictatorship over the bourgeoisie. This made him feel uncomfortable from head to toe, and he made up his mind to overthrow the verdict. After he returned to work, he could not wait to raise the banner of "taking the three directives as the key link," and everywhere he said things like "any method will work," "no need to fear those who speak of restoration," "some people just said the 'home-going contingent' has come back," etc. In plain truth, he harped on the old tune of "relaxation." In reality, the theory of "relaxation" is the theory of nullification -- through nullifying class struggle, it nullifies the dictatorship of the proletariat once and for all. It isn't strange that once the revisionist program of "taking the three directives as the key link" became current, those bourgeois philistines who, as Engels said, "scream for help as soon as they hear of the dictatorship of the proletariat," all jubilantly came forward: in educational circles, some publicly opposed turning schools into tools of the dictatorship of the proletariat; some in scientific and technological circles publicly clamored that "on the scientific and technological front, the dictatorship of the proletariat need not be raised"; in literary and art circles, some people, starting from the absurd argument that "class struggle cannot be everywhere in life," attacked literary and art works emphasizing class struggle as "absolutist" and opposed dictatorship by the proletariat over the bourgeoisie in literature and arts. It is extremely clear that the basic reason the unrepentant capitalist roader Teng Hsiao-p'ing threw out the revisionist program of "taking the three directives as the key link" and negated taking class struggle as the key link was to subvert the dictatorship of the proletariat and restore the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

To negate taking class struggle as the key link is to negate the continuing revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat. Socialist society still contains traces left behind by the old society, bourgeois rights and the three major differences. These all are the soil and conditions for nourishing the bourgeoisie and capitalism. Chairman Mao has pointed out: "Our country at present practices a commodity system, the wage system is not equal, there being the eight-grade wage scale, etc.

This can be limited only under the dictatorship of the proletariat. Therefore, if people like Lin Piao come to power, it would be very easy for them to rig up the capitalist system." This tells us that the major question of the two-class, two-line struggle during the socialist period is whether to limit and gradually eliminate bourgeois rights or to strengthen and unceasingly expand them. Therefore, resolutely taking class struggle as the key link, unceasingly restricting bourgeois rights in the economic base and in all realms of the superstructure, criticizing the idea of bourgeois rights, gradually reducing the three major differences, gradually clearing away the soil which produces and preserves the bourgeoisie and capitalism become the great long-term task of continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat. If class struggle as the key link and the restriction of bourgeois rights are negated, then one cannot talk about continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The unrepentant capitalist roader Teng Hsiao-p'ing clamored about "taking the three directives as the key link" in order to oppose continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat. He represented the interests of the bourgeoisie inside and outside the Party and did his utmost to protect, strengthen and expand bourgeois rights. In the Party there are some people who have become high officials and want to protect their advantages. They have good houses, cars, high salaries, even servants -- even better than the capitalists. They themselves do not make revolution, nor do they permit others to do so. It is precisely as Chairman Mao recently pointed out: "With the socialist revolution they themselves come under fire. At the time of the cooperative transformation of agriculture, there were people in the Party who opposed it, and when it comes to criticizing bourgeois rights, they resent it." When the majority of the cadres and masses, following Chairman Mao's instructions, proposed to restrict those bourgeois rights they protected, they were desperately afraid and extremely hateful. The unrepentant capitalist roader Teng Hsiao-p'ing especially and abundantly demonstrated his skills on this question. Under his banner of "taking the three directives as the key link" he madly opposed socialist new things which restricted bourgeois rights on all sides, denouncing in all ways criticism of material incentives, private ownership of knowledge and other ideas of bourgeois rights. He even brazenly sang a tune opposed to Chairman Mao's instructions. He wildly said: "To restrict bourgeois rights, one needs to have a material basis; without it, how can there be restrictions?" This fully exposed his advocacy of "taking the three directives as the key link" as a negation of class struggle as the key link in order to oppose the restriction of bourgeois rights and to oppose continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In order to block people's attention, the unrepentant capitalist roader Teng Hsiao-p'ing concealed his diabolic designs and adopted an artistry which easily could deceive people. He concocted a revisionist program, using only Chairman Mao's words, and advocated the three

directives as "one complete unit of which not even one sentence can be thrown away" as if he was "fully" consistent with Chairman Mao's directives. However, we only need to use the viewpoint of materialist dialectics to analyze the basic revisionist nature of this use of Marxist terms to express anti-Marxist thoughts to be able to completely expose it.

What is the key link? The key link is the principal contradiction. The relationship between the key link and things that hinge on it is that between the principal and secondary contradictions.

Chairman Mao says: "Throughout the various stages of development, there is only one principal contradiction playing the leading role." The socialist period has only one principal contradiction, therefore our work can have only one key link. After all, what should be taken as the key link? That is to say, what is the principal contradiction in socialist society? Only by making an analysis of the class relationships in socialist society can one come up with the correct answer. Marxism holds that in a society in which classes exist, society's principal contradiction can only be the major class contradiction. In capitalist society, the principal contradiction is the one between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie and this contradiction's major aspect is the bourgeois class. In socialist society, the dictatorship of the proletariat has replaced the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat has become the ruling class rather than the ruled, causing a change in the major aspect of the contradiction. However, this does not mean the final resolution of this contradiction. Chairman Mao has repeatedly pointed out: after the dictatorship of the proletariat is established, after the socialist transformation of the ownership of the means of production is basically completed, the question of whether the proletariat or the bourgeoisie has won or lost still is unresolved. Lenin also clearly pointed out: the historical stage of socialism is a period of transition from capitalism to communism, "a period of struggle between defeated but still not eliminated capitalism and born but still extremely frail communism." These teach us that the principal contradiction of socialist society is still between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. At any time and on any front, we must grasp this principal contradiction and grasp the key link among thousands of complex issues.

Chairman Mao also points out: "In any process, if several contradictions exist, among them there must be one that is principal and which serves as the guide and determinent; the others all occupy secondary and subordinate positions." During the socialist period, if only we grasp class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie as the principal contradiction and raise class struggle as the key link, to let everything else fall in place, work in various fields will have a correct orientation and be done well. We believe class struggle can lead everything and that revolution can change everything. Raising the key link of class struggle will start the locomotive of revolution. Revolution is the liberator of productive forces. Chairman Mao points out: "The great proletarian cultural revolution is a strong motive force for the development of social productive forces in our country." This scientific

thesis both revealed the basic reason for the rapid development of our productive forces and indicated the basic power for further development of productive forces. If we follow the revisionist program of "taking the three directives as the key link," place development of the national economy as the key link, abandon class struggle, "not care whether it is a black or a white cat," and make no distinction between Marxism and revisionism, socialism and imperialism, it will be academic to talk about advancing the national economy and realizing the four modernizations; either we cannot achieve these goals or we will follow the side road of revisionism and realize imperialism or social-imperialism's modernization. The problem of stability and unity should also be viewed in a similar light. If stability and unity are taken as the key link and everything is subordinate to stability and unity, stability and unity will be used to restrict and negate class struggle, with the result of either destroying true stability and unity or of establishing a false stability and unity advantageous to the bourgeoisie's attack on the proletariat. In sum, whether we carry out economic construction, develop stability and unity, or do other work, we can only bear the key link of class struggle in mind. If class struggle as the key link is cut off, all our work will have an unclear direction and will follow the incorrect road.

It can be seen that we must accurately understand and solve the principal and secondary contradictions, the relationship between the key link and things that hinge on it, resolutely adhere to the theory of materialist dialectics concerning the disproportionate strength of contradictions, and criticize the metaphysical theories of balance or equilibrium. Metaphysical theories of balance or equilibrium are eclecticism. "The three directives as the key link" thrown out by the unrepentant capitalist roader Teng Hsiao-p'ing uses eclecticism to pass off for and oppose dialectics. The signboard of "universality" they / sic / raised mixed the principal and secondary contradictions, failed to recognize the distinction between the key link and things that hinge on it, and negated taking class struggle as the key link. This tactic was like that used by Bukharin, Trotsky and other revisionists in Soviet history who were bitterly denounced by Lenin. Bukharin attacked Lenin as one who saw problems "politically" while they saw them "economically." Lenin refuted them saying: "Politics cannot but take precedence over economics. Those who don't affirm this point have forgotten the ABC of Marxism." He also said: "If one says (or only indirectly expresses the thought) that looking at questions politically and looking at questions 'economically' are of equal value and the 'two ways' can be utilized, one forgets the ABC of Marxism." Lenin further said: "All questions consist of (and from the Marxist viewpoint, can only consist of) the fact that if a class doesn't correctly handle questions politically, it will not be able to safeguard its rule, and hence it will not be able to resolve its productive task." What Lenin here elucidated is actually the basic Marxist viewpoint that class struggle is the key link.

Resolutely taking class struggle as the key link is to insist on the fundamental theory and practice of our Party promoting socialist

revolution. For a long time Chairman Mao has continually pointed out to the whole Party and people of the whole country that they must never forget this fundamental theory and practice, otherwise, "the direction will be lost," "the wrong road will be taken," and "then a nationwide counter-revolutionary restoration will be inevitable." However, those capitalist roaders in the Party have repeatedly betrayed Chairman Mao's instructions on this crucial question of principle and repeatedly provoked the proletariat. This fact itself shows the protracted and complicated nature of the class and line struggle during the socialist period and that bourgeois representatives opposing the socialist revolution are inside our Party and are Party persons in power taking the capitalist road. Among them some, like Liu Shao-ch'i and Lin Piao, were alien class elements who got into the Party during the period of democratic revolution and wholeheartedly opposed revolution. Others belonged to the small group of bourgeois democrats whose attitude and world view did not change. Although they performed some work during the democratic revolution period, they have never been true Marxists, only the Party's fellow travelers. After the new democratic revolution was won, the broad masses of workers and poor and lower-middle peasants didn't stop nor did the masses of Party members and cadres. But some bourgeois democrats did grind to a halt. Their ideology stopped at the democratic revolution stage. They were afraid of socialist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat; therefore they wanted to promote the revisionist line and restore capitalism. That is why the unrepentant capitalist roader Teng Hsiao-p'ing clamored "take the three directives as the key link" to oppose taking class struggle as the key link and stirred up the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts to oppose the great proletarian cultural revolution.

Therefore, in the present struggle to repulse the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts we must take class struggle as the key link and resolutely use the Marxist viewpoint of class struggle and method of class analysis to observe and handle problems. Only thus can the vital meaning of the life and death combat between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie be understood and this struggle be carried resolutely through to the end.

At present, the great struggle to repulse the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts is developing vigorously and the situation is excellent. However, class enemies certainly have not conceded defeat. They still carry out disturbances and destruction in many places. In order to obtain even greater victories in the struggle to repulse the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts, we must conscientiously study Chairman Mao's important directives, firmly grasp the struggle's main orientation and concentrate firepower on severely criticizing the counter-revolutionary revisionist line promoted by the unrepentant capitalist roader Teng Hsiao-p'ing. "Nothing is hard in this world if you dare to scale the heights." Let us, under the guidance of Chairman Mao's revolutionary line, resolutely take class struggle as the key link, grasp the nettle on the road of continuing revolution, advance courageously and fight for still greater victories.

* * *

"Masterpiece" of Hegemonism

- Comment on China's Modern History published in Moscow

by

Wu Yin-nien (吴寅年)

(Li-shih Yen-chiu /Historical Research/, No. 2, April 20, 1976)

Through its falsification and tampering with Chinese modern history and its distortion and fabrication of Sino-Russian relations, China's Modern History, edited by Tikhvinskiy and published in Moscow, fully reflects the series of reactionary views of the Soviet revisionist new tsars regarding their aggressive and subversive activities against China, and exposes the tactic of this superpower of making a feint to the east while striking in the west and carrying out expansion everywhere as well as their wild ambition of world domination. The new tsars' self-defense, their threats to others, their insatiable greed, their justification of their own high-handed actions -- all these are brought out in bold relief in the book without any reserve. Judging by the spiritual aspect of the hegemonic doctrine of a superpower as reflected in the book, it can really be said to be a "masterpiece" of the steadily degenerating science of Soviet revisionist historiography.

One of the outstanding features of China's Modern History is its complete abandonment of the scientific conclusions of Marxism-Leninism and its doctoring of China's modern history and misrepresentation of Sino-Russian relations from the reactionary historical viewpoint of bourgeois nationalism and Greater Russian chauvinism. The extremeness of its falsity defies description.

First,Tikhvinskiy and company begin China's modern history from 1644, the year when the Manchu dynasty was established. The "reason" is that "The Manchu conquest of China, then ruled by feudal Ming, coincided with the upper limit -- the 40's of the 17th century -- of modern world history."* It would be wrong to think that they are singing the old tune of "Europe is the center of the world." Their main problem is not there. The reason why the book starts China's modern history at such an early date is that it wants to make the "opposition to the Manchu rulers" the "principal focus" and put the "foreign relations and foreign policy of the Manchus," namely, the imperialist aggression against and rule of China, in a "subordinate position," thus highlighting the contradiction of nationalities in the country and covering up the most important contradiction between imperialism and the Chinese nation, and radically reversing the relationship between the principal and

---

* China's Modern History, edited by Tikhvinskiy, 1972 edition of Soviet Science Publishing House. Further quotations from this book will not be noted.

secondary contradictions in modern Chinese society. The book denies the decisive role played by imperialist aggression in turning China into a semi-colonial, semi-feudal society, as well as the imperialist rule in China and its utilization of feudalism as a pillar supporting its rule of China, the object being to deny that the modern era in China was an era of bourgeois democratic revolution in which the Chinese people opposed imperialism and feudalism.

Marx and Engels pointed out long ago in "Communist Manifesto" that the slave-owner and the slave, the feudal lord and the serf, and the bourgeoisie and the working class were the principal class antagonisms in ancient, medieval and modern society respectively. In their series of writings, they also dissertated on the several stages of historical development of mankind of the primitive society, slave society, feudal society and capitalist society. After the 17th century the furious tidal waves of capitalism that rose in the West drew the whole world into the eddy they created. Like a maniac the bourgeoisie roamed hither and thither all over the world, creating a world for itself in its own image. "Just as it subordinates the countryside to the city, it subordinates uncivilized and semi-civilized countries to the civilized ones, peasant nations to bourgeois nations, and the East to the West." ("Communist Manifesto") Following the bloody conquests and plunder of the capitalist powers, a great number of weak countries and regions became colonies and semi-colonies one after another, thus beginning to enter the modern era of their history. It may be seen from this that in Europe, North America and Japan, so-called modern history is the history of the establishment, development and initial decline of capitalism, but that in other regions it is a history of the aggression against and enslavement of these regions by capitalist powers, their becoming colonies and semi-colonies, and the resistance of the people of these regions to such aggression and enslavement. China's modern history belongs to this latter category.

China's modern history began from the Opium War between China and Britain in 1840, and not from the establishment of the Manchu dynasty in 1644 as Tikhvinskiy and company make it. The basic reason is that the Manchu dynasty established in 1644 was basically no different from the feudal Ming dynasty in its social character and class relations. The bourgeois revolution in England, which occurred at about that time, had nothing whatever to do with the old, feudal China in the East in any way. It was not until the Opium War provoked by the British two centuries later that China's social character and class relations underwent profound changes and marked the beginning of a different era. China began to be involved in the world capitalist system and gradually sank into a semi-colonial, semi-feudal society. Foreign capitalism occupied a dominant position in economic, political, military, cultural and ideological and all important spheres of Chinese social life as a whole, undermining the feudal society of China. Henceforth China lost its position as an independent country, and the feudal ruling class gradually became a pillar supporting the foreign bourgeois rule of China. Once having intruded into China, imperialism became the first and most malignant enemy of the Chinese people and the

most reactionary force that obstructed the development of Chinese society. Chairman Mao pointed out: "The contradiction between imperialism and the Chinese nation and that between feudalism and the masses of people -- these are the principal contradictions of modern Chinese society.... And the contradiction between imperialism and the Chinese nation is the most important of all contradictions." ("The Chinese Revolution and the Chinese Communist Party") This is the social character of modern China and its basic class relations. The splendid history and reality of the Chinese revolution has fully demonstrated and will continue to demonstrate the infallible truth of this Marxist-Leninist scientific thesis.

Imperialist aggression turned China into a colony or semi-colony from the Opiun War onward. This is a fact which Tikhvinskiy and company can never obliterate. With the exception of the most pigheaded imperialists, who dare to deny this fact today? The falsification and distortion by Tikhvinskiy and company exactly serves to show them as this kind of the most pigheaded imperialist reactionaries.

Second, Tikhvinskiy and company do their utmost to describe the acts of conquest, slaughter and plunder of the "Manchus" on a nationwide scale and the "anti-Manchu" struggle of the Han and other nationalities. This is made the main thread of the book that goes through up to the Revolution of 1911. They oppose national struggle to class struggle and replace the latter with the former. At one stroke China's modern history becomes a history of national struggle against the Manchus.

Marxism-Leninism tells us that the whole history of mankind, with the exception of that of the primitive society, is a history of class struggle. The question of national struggle is,in the final analysis,a question of class struggle. There has never been simple and pure national struggle that is separated from class struggle. At different ages national struggles has a different content of class struggle. Owing to imperialist aggression, class struggle and national struggle in China after the Opium War of 1840 were different in form as well as in content from those of the past. Before the Opium War China, as a unified, multi-national feudal country, had of course national contradictions and national struggle like all other multi-national feudal countries of the world. But the question is that shouting national contradiction and exaggerating national struggle in order to cover up the class content does nothing whatever to help uncover the truth of history. At that time the basic contradiction in Chinese society was the opposition between the two major classes of landlords and peasants. Regardless of its nationality, the landlord class, including the slave-owner class of some nationalities, was the ruling class. On the other hand, all peasants, including the working masses who were still serfs and slaves, were the subject class regardless of their nationality. The so-called national struggle or anti-Manchu struggle was subordinated to either the peasants' struggle against the landlords or the struggle between different groups and factions within the landlord class. When the people of various nationalities resisted the Manchu government, they often opposed at the same time their exploitation and oppression by feudal landlords of their own nationalities, while the Manchu government suppressed the people's struggle of resistance jointly

with the feudal landlords of these nationalities. At the high tide of the struggle of the masses of the people, some feudal landlords might join in, but always starting from the interests of their own class, they often betrayed the people at critical moments. These feudal landlords of various nationalities who struggled against the central government in the interest of their own group or faction could not represent the people at all. On the contrary, they would intensify their oppression and exploitation of the people of their own nationalities in order to conduct the struggle. Only a chauvinist would confuse such struggle, which had no progressive significance whatever, with the struggle of the people. Generally speaking, the national struggle or anti-Manchu struggle during the Manchu times passed through these several stages: When the Manchus entered the Pass /Shanhaikuan/ from the Northeast, the pro-Manchu and anti-Ming factions of the Ming landlord class conspired with the Manchu nobles to suppress the peasant risings with armed force and smash the resistance of the anti-Manchu, pro-Ming faction of landlords, enabling the Manchu regime to be basically established nation-wide. After that, the resistance of the anti-Manchu factions of landlords changed from the form of open warfare into two other forms of struggle: one was propagation of anti-Manchu ideas by making use and developing the old teaching of "the barrier between the eastern barbarians and Hsia"; the other was control of secret societies of the people and propaganda of "overthrow of Ch'ing /Manchus/ and restoration of Ming." This struggle within the landlord class, waged under the slogan of national struggle, was only for the purpose of seizing power and restoring the feudal rule of Ming. It did not aim to, and could not, radically overthrow the feudal rule of the time. Toward the end of the 18th century and in the yearly years of the 19th, peasant movements, signaled by the rising of the White Lotus Sect, rose prevalently. Various factions of the landlord class then united to suppress the peasant revolution. After that, the anti-Manchu banner became one for rallying the masses in some peasant risings. As for the anti-Manchu struggle against the Opium War, it was in effect the Chinese people's struggle against the Manchu government, a running dog of imperialism, and served the needs of the general mission of the Chinese people's anti-imperialist, anti-feudal struggle. Its character was completely different from that of the anti-Manchu struggle before the Opium War. The book does not analyze the class content of the national contradictions during the Manchu regime or the class antagonisms within the different nationalities themselves. It absolutely avoids discussing the class essence of modern China's anti-Manchu struggle, but exclusively exaggerates the national contradictions and struggles within the country, so as to fabricate history. This is a typical reactionary bourgeois interpretation of national history.

Third, Tikhvinskiy and company assert preposterously that the Han alone are the"Chinese nation" and that the Manchu, Mongol, Hui, Tibetan, Uighur, Chuang and other minority nationalities of China are "non-Chinese peoples" and the areas in which these nationalities live are not Chinese territory. The Manchus "live beyond China's territory of Liaotung (Southern Manchuria)," areas such as Mongolia, Sinkiang and Tibet inhabited by the minority nationalities "were arbitrarily incorporated in the domain of the Manchu empire by use of brutal force," the policy of the Manchu government toward the Miao, Yao, Chuang and other minority nationalities in the 18th century was its "foreign

policy," and so on and so forth. According to their assertions, the Hans mean the Chinese, areas beyond those inhabited by the Hans are not China, the inauguration of the Manchu dynasty was a foreign conquest of China, and Manchu unification of the country was territorial expansion outside China. This is complete poppycock with ulterior motives.

Marxism-Leninism holds that from the day of its birth, a state always "defines its nationals according to the regions to which they belong." (Engels: "The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State") Most countries of the world are multi-national, and the same nation is often separately settled in several different countries. "There is not one single state boundary line that coincides with the natural boundary line of a nation, that is, the boundary line of language." (Engels: "What Relationship the Working Class Has With Poland?") China was already a unified multi-national feudal country more than 2,000 years ago. No matter how one feudal dynasty succeeded another or which nationality became the ruling one, China has always existed in the world as a multi-national country. China's frontiers have changed many times in history, but they have never been limited to regions inhabited by the Han nationality. In 1644 Manchu nobles took the place of the Ming dynasty of the Han landlord class and established the Manchu regime. That was such a succession of feudal dynasties. As in former dynastic successions, the Manchus unified China and established a new unified dynasty on a new basis after the suppression of peasant risings and subjugation of the entrenched forces of various feudal lords and serf owners by one family of the landlord class. The territory under the unified rule of the Manchus was roughly the same territory ruled by several most powerful feudal dynasties in past Chinese history. Tikhvinskiy and company separate the minority nationalities of China from the Chinese nation and deny that the regions they inhabit are Chinese territory. This is extremely preposterous and reactionary.

The existence of a multi-national, unified country certainly cannot be indefinitely maintained merely by armed force. A unified multi-national country like China in particular is certainly not a short-term union of say 200 or 300 years, but formed as a result of gradual historical development of several thousand years. In their common struggle against imperilaism and feudalism in the past hundred years, the mutual support and unity of the people of all nationalities in China has drawn their mutual relations even closer. There was the struggle of the people of Tibetan, Manchu and Han nationalities in the Tibetan region against British aggression during the Opium War. During the period of the T'ai-p'ing T'ien-kuo revolution there was the struggle of the people of Han, Chuang, Yao, Hui, I and Miao nationalities against the Manchu government, the running dog of imperialism, and the struggle of the people of Kazakh, Uighur, Manchu and Han nationalities in Sinkiang jointly against tsarist Russia's occupation of Ili. During the I-ho-t'uan movement there was the struggle of the people of Manchu, Han, Mongol, Hoche and Olunchun nationalities in the Northeast against tsarist Russia's invasion of the three Northeastern provinces and the struggle of the people of all nationalities against the partition of China by the imperialist powers. During the 1911 Revolution there was the struggle of the people of all nationalities jointly against the Manchu government, the running dog of

imperialism, the struggle of the people of Tibetan, Manchu and Han nationalities in the Tibetan region against British aggression, the struggle of the people of Mongol, Manchu and Han nationalities against tsarist Russia's splitting of Mongolia, etc. All these were an embodiment of such mutual support support and unity. It is exactly this mutual support among the fraternal nationalities and their unyielding, united struggle that has for a long time prevented, and will always prevent, imperialism from destroying China. Thus China's modern history is a history of joint struggle by the people of all nationalities of China against imperialism and feudalism. In writing China's modern history Tikhvinskiy and company did not write such a history, but have altered the whole modern history of China so it becomes a history of Han opposition to Manchu conquest. This is an open and audacious attempt to create a historical basis for the division of China. If the modern history of the Soviet Union were to be written in accordance with this "principle" of defining countries according to nationalities invented by these Soviet revisionist sirs, then obviously only the history of the Russian nationality should be written and the history of the other nationalities should be excluded from it. Let us ask: In writing the history of the Soviet Union, do you write the history of only that small region in the upper reaches of the Volga originally inhabited by Russians? You wouldn't do that. But why do you deliberately falsify and alter in this way the Chinese history formed over the past several thousand years?

Fourth, Tikhvinskiy and company advance the upper limit of China's modern history, ignore the imperialist rule over China, and falsely accuse China of being "the greatest aggressor of Asia."* They assert preposterously that leaders of China's peasant revolutions had "the extravagant ambition of lording it over the whole world," that "there were paranoid anti-foreign ideas and chauvinistic propaganda" in the Chinese people's resistance to foreign religious aggression, that the I-ho-t'uan movement was "blind hostility toward foreign culture, and even negation of progressive things in general," that the propagation of Chinese bourgeois revolutionary thought was often concommitant with "the growth of pan-Hanism, chauvinism and xenophobia," that even in the "contemporary period" China's working masses are still deeply influenced by "bourgeois nationalistic thought," etc. According to their assertions, China's modern history is not one of imperialist aggression against China, but one of chauvinism of all classes of Chinese society and Chinese aggression against other countries.

As a feudal ruler and starting from its class nature, the Manchu government, like many other feudal rulers in the world, assumed a big-power chauvinist attitude toward some neighboring countries. It was impossible not to do so. The Chinese people assume no responsibility whatsoever for that. The situation in modern China and Asia is totally different. Here

---

* Nikifurov (尼基福洛夫), "Book Review, China's Modern History," carried in the Soviet magazine Contemporary and Modern History, No. 4, 1973.

it is imperialism which has invaded and occupied China's neighboring countries. It is Russia who occupied the khanates of Central Asia, Britain who occupied Burma, France who occupied Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia, the United States who occupied the Philippines, and Japan who occupied Korea. It is they who turned these countries into their colonies. It is imperialism which came to China to carry out aggression. It is Britain who obtained the cession of and occupied Hong Kong, which is Chinese territory, Russia who invaded and occupied Chinese territory north of Heilungkiang, east of the Ussuri, and south and east of Lake Balkhash, and Japan who invaded and occupied China's Taiwan province. It is imperialism which opened settlements in Chinese territory and forcibly occupied leased territory, not China who occupied the territory of other countries. The territory occupied by tsarist Russia in Siberia and Central Asian khanates is three times the area of the European part of Russia, that occupied by Britain in India and Burma was 19 times the area of the three British isles, and even that occupied by France in Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia was larger than the area of France. Is it not quite clear who is the greatest aggressor in Asia? Even the Manchu government, which Tikhvinskiy and company used to attack the Chinese people, became a tool of imperialism in its rule over and enslavement of the Chinese people. All this is general knowledge. But Tikhvinskiy and company deliberately call black white and vice versa and make fabrications out of nothing. What sort of "China's modern history" is that?

The Chinese people, being victims of aggression, have consistently opposed aggression. They have suffered imperialist aggression and oppression for more than a hundred years. Should they suffer that only submissively without rising in resistance? In the Opium War the Chinese people resisted Britain's aggression. Was that chauvinism? In the T'ai-p'ing T'ien-kuo revolution the Chinese people resisted the joint attack of imperialism and its running dog the Manchu government. Was that chauvinism? In the Second Opium War the Chinese people resisted the aggression of the allied armies of Britain and France. Was that chauvinism? The Chinese people resisted Russia's occupation of large pieces of territory in China's Northeast and Northwest. Was that chauvinism? The Chinese people waged anti-Church struggle against foreign missions which did evil things in China. Was that chauvinism? France and Japan provoked war against China and the Chinese people rose in resistance. Was that chauvinism? Various imperialisms forcibly occupied settlements in China, carved out spheres of influence and exacted from China numerous rights and privileges. In opposition to such partitioning and to save the country from extinction, the Chinese people started the I-ho-t'uan movement and hit back at aggression by the 8-nation allied armies. Was that chauvinism? The Chinese people rose to overthrow the Manchu government which had become completely a tool of imperialist aggression against and rule over China. Was that chauvinism? No, none of these can be called chauvinism. All this was none other than the Chinese people resisting foreign aggression in their own territory. Where did chauvinism come in? However, Tikhvinskiy and company confuse right and wrong as if they had seen ghosts in broad daylight. What sort of "China's modern history" is that?

All actions taken by the Chinese people in their own territory against imperialist robbers are just, revolutionary actions no matter what form they take, what kind of arms is used and what time an attack takes place. In commenting on the Second Opium War, Engels highly praised the courageous struggle waged by the Chinese people by various means against Anglo-French aggression and sternly refuted various erroneous views which falsely accused the Chinese people of being "barbarians." Upon the outbreak of the I-ho-t'uan movement the imperialist, in particular tsarist Russian, press launched a rabid attack on the Chinese people and reviled them. Lenin righteously and sternly refuted these attacks by publishing his famous brilliant essay, "The War in China." In his essay "Socialism and War," he also warmly supported the just struggle by China and all victims of aggression against tsarist Russian and other imperialist aggression. He said, "If tomorrow Morocco declared war on France, India declared war on Britain, Persia or China declared war on Russia, and so on, these would be 'just,' 'defensive' wars regardless of who attacked first. Any socialist will sympathize with the oppressed, subordinate countries without integral sovereignty and hope that they will defeat the 'big' powers who are the oppressors, slave-owners and predators." How earnestly the teacher of revolution supported, praised and sympathized with the anti-imperialist struggle of the Chinese people, but how rabidly Tikhvinskiy and company oppose, smear and attack it! What a sharp contrast!

Fifth, the book devotes a great deal of space to the defense of tsarist Russia's aggression against China. According to the authors, it appears that tsarist Russia never committed aggression against China, but it was the Manchu government of China which voluntarily presented its territorial sovereignty to Russia. As everybody knows, the history of Sino-Russian relations is one of tsarist Russian aggression against and oppression of China. This has been repeatedly expounded by Marxist-Leninist classic writers.

Speaking in 1857-58 of tsarist Russia's invasion and occupation of China's Heilung River basin, Marx said, "It has been only a few years since (tsarist Russia) occupied the land on both sides of the Heilung River -- home of the present ruling nationality of China." ("Russia's Trade With China") "In the past Russia wanted very much to seize this region. It always tried to occupy this region from Tsar Alexei Mihailovich to Nicolai." ("Treaties Between China and Great Britain")

Commenting on the course of the tsar's seizure of this land from China, Engels wrote in the same period: "Just as the British and French navies and armies were being despatched to Hong Kong, Cossack troops on the Siberian frontier slowly but continuously moved their garrison quarters from Tahur Mountain to the banks of the Heilung River, while Russian marines built forts around the good harbors of Manchuria." ("Persia and China") "When Britain finally decided to advance to Peking and France, hoping to grab something for herself, followed at Britain's heels," Russia "actually stood up to act as the just and selfless protector of enfeebled China, and blatantly regarded itself as the mediator when the peace treaty was concluded." "Apart from having a share of all the obvious interests won by Britain and France, it also got the area on the banks of the Heilung River." ("Russian Success in the Far East")

Lenin on many occasions sharply criticized the tsarist government's aggression against and plundering of China. He pointed out in 1900: "The tsarist government's policy toward China is a criminal policy." "The greedy devilish hands of European capitalists are now stretching toward China. The Russian government is probably the first to stretch out the devilish hands." ("The War in China") In 1912 Lenin pointed out: "Now the Tsar is the gendarme not only of Europe, but also of Asia. He strives hard to suppress all movements to win freedom in Turkey, Persia and China with intrigue, money and the most barbarous force." ("Election Platform of the Russian Socialist Democratic Workers Party") In 1916-17 Lenin again pointed out: "As a matter of fact the whole world knows...that Russia has been carrying out a predatory policy toward China, Persia, Armenia and Galicia for several decades." ("Speech at the International Rally in Berne") "If only one turns over the pages -- even by so much as a single flip -- of the history of foreign relations and foreign policy of the past several decades, it will be impossible not to see this or to deny it." ("Following in the Footsteps of Russian Will Journal")

Stalin pointed out in 1924: "Tsarist Russia was the source of all kinds of oppression -- capitalist, colonial and military -- expressed in the most cruel, most barbarous form. ...Who does not know that the exploitation of vast areas of Turkey, Persia and China was fused with the tsarist system's invasion and occupation of these areas and wars for such invasion and occupation?" ("The Foundation of Leninism")

These words of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin point out clearly that beginning from the reign of Alexei Mihailovich in mid-17th century, tsarist Russia always tried to invade and seize Chinese territory. Beginning from the second Opium War in mid-19th century, it became one of the principal culprits of aggression against China in the company of Britain, France and the United States. Yet Tikhvinskiy and company, complying with the wishes of the Soviet revisionist renegade clique, shamelessly turn against the teachings of these mentors of proletarian revolution.

Soviet writings before the 1960's and scholars of old Russia never glossed over the question of tsarist Russia's seizure of vast areas of Chinese territory. Even some generals and ministers of the old tsars admitted the fact. For example, History of Civil Wars in the Soviet Union, published in the 1930's, points out: "In the 16th-17th centuries Russia, whose tsarist system reflected the interests of the ruling class, began to conduct broad military expeditions to the East. In mid-19th century Alexander II seized from China areas along the Heilung River and the Ussuri." A work written in tsarist times also says: The Ming imperial court "established local administrative organs (in T'e-lin in the lower reaches of the Heilung River) and changed Nurkan into a tu-shih /territory under a military governor/ of provincial level."* It was admitted that the Tahur region east of

---

* Vasiliev, "Concerning Records of Inscribed Texts on Cliffs Near Mouth of the Heilung River," carried in tsarist Russian Academy of Sciences Bulletin, No. 4, 1896.

Lake Baikal and north of the Heilung River was "the northernmost region of China."* Even G.I. Nevelskoy, a vanguard of tsarist Russian aggression against China, had to admit that the Heilung River region "was openly recognized by our (Russian) government and the whole civilized world as a region belonging to China."** These statements need no explanation. However, according to the assertions of Tikhvinskiy and company, the bellicose tsar was a friend of China, all boundary lines between the two countries were defined through "peaceful ways," tsarist Russia "never evinced any initiative" in its various activities of aggression against China, etc. Such clumsy explanations do not hold water.

Sixth, from 1858 Russia, by means of armed threats and diplomatic blackmail and through forcing China to sign a series of unequal treaties including the "treaty of Aigun," the "treaty of Peking" and "Summary of Sino-Russian Delimitation of the Northwest Frontier," seized from China at one time or another over 1,500,000 sq. km. of territory. This is rare even in the world annals of colonies. This is a fact known to the whole world. Yet in accordance with the needs of the Soviet revisionist new tsars, Tikhvinskiy and company cudgel their brains to make up all sorts of shameless lie in defense of the old tsars.

(1) The idea of "recovery of lost territory." The idea begins with the treaty of Ni-pu-ch'u (Nerchinsk) of 1689. It has always been recognized that this was an equal treaty, a fact admitted in Soviet works after the October Revolution and in works published in tsarist times. Yet the book totally distorts the character of the treaty, concludes finally that Russia "lost a very large piece of territory" as a result, and describes the Russian seizure of Chinese territory south of the Lesser Khingan Mountains and north of the Heilung River, effected through forcing China to sign the treaty of Aigun in 1858, as "return to Russia of a large part of the territory which Russia lost in 1689." It was not Russian seizure of Chinese territory, but Chinese seizure of Russian territory. What a strange idea! If the "treaty of Ni-pu-ch'u" had been such a humiliating treaty as they say it was, then why was the Russian plenipotentiary envoy promoted and honored by the tsar for his part in the conclusion of the treaty? If the treaty ceded any territory at all, it was the concession made by the Manchu government of China to Russia, by which a piece of territory including Ni-pu-ch'u was ceded to Russia.

(2) The idea of "development of new land." They say, "Russian territory in the Far East and Central Asia was expanded by joining lands which were inhabited by neither Chinese nor Manchus and moreover were economically not

---

* Encyclopedic Dictionary, Petersburg edition of 1833, Vol. II, p. 161.

** G.I. Nevelskoy, Achievements of Russian Naval Officers in Russian Far East (1849-1855), Moscow edition of 1947, p. 363.

related to China under the Manchu regime." They also say that the Heilung River was "discovered" in mid-17th century by Russian "new land discoverers," that the Heilung River basin was "developed" by Russian "settlers," etc. Let us ask: Since tsarist Russia could occupy these lands without any ado because they were not inhabited or administered by anyone, why did it come to China to apply pressure on the Manchu government and force it to sign a treaty recognizing Russian possession of these lands? Does this not show exactly that it was Russia who seized these lands from China?

(3) The idea of "self-defense." They say that Russia seized the lower reaches of the Heilung River and the maritime region because there existed "a threat from the Western powers" of Britain, France and the United States, and that occupation of China's Ili region by Russian troops was "to forbid British influence from expanding into Russian territory in Central Asia." This is robber's logic in defense of aggressive expansion under the banner of "self-defense." If you Russians can occupy a piece of territory of another country under this excuse, and the Western powers occupy another piece of territory of yet another country under the excuse of the existence of "a threat of Russian occupation," and if this goes on and on, will the whole world not be partitioned by you several "powers" alone?

(4) The idea of "resettlement of refugees." They say that ten years after the Russian occupation of China's Ili region, Russia finally seized "a not large (!) piece of land in the western part of the Ili frontier" through an unequal treaty "for the sake of allotting land to the Uighur and Tungkan refugees from Dzungaria and Eastern Turkestan." This is extremely shameless defense. Some inhabitants of China's frontier were placed under tsarist Russian rule by agitation, deception, coercion, threats and other vicious means so as to create large numbers of "refugees," and then in the name of these "refugees" Russia turned on China to carry out extortion. This was indeed a great invention of the old tsars. Inheriting the right to this invention, the Soviet revisionist new tsars still ceaselessly carry out subversive and divisive activities in our frontier regions by similar means.

These erroneous views are merely hackneyed tunes sung repeatedly by imperialist old-timers. They are all reproductions of the view that "expansion is justified." Tikhvinskiy and company use them to cover up the fact of the old tsars' seizure and occupation of China's territory. But the result can only be contrary to their wish. It is a case where the more one tries to cover up something, the more evident it becomes.

Seventh, Tikhvinskiy and company whitewash the old tsars' crime of aggression against China, calling it euphemistically acts of "friendliness and neighborliness" and declaring that Russia was "different" from the Western powers. They say that before the Opium War and up to mid-19th century Russia, unlike Britain, France and the United States, "devoted itself to establishing" and "maintaining friendly, neighborly relations" with China. To prove this "difference," they assert that the treaties signed between China and Russia embodied the spirit of "consultation" and the characteristics of "peace," that the "treaty of Aigun" was a result of "negotiations" between representatives of both China and Russia, that the Sino-Russian "treaty of

Tientsin" and "treaty of Peking" were concluded after Russian representatives "acted as a mediator" and "played a mediatory role" between the Manchu government and Britain and France, that the long Sino-Russian border was established "through peaceful diplomatic channels" on the basis of these treaties, that "Russo-Chinese trade, characterized by complete equality, was conducted through mercantile caravans," and so on. But facts effectively refuted these lies. During the second Opium War tsarist Russia, taking advantage of another's plight and seizing upon the opportunity of the Anglo-French joint attack on China, made military threats to the Manchu government, carried out diplomatic extortion, and even resorted to the ignoble means of first occupying territory and then forcing the victim to sign a treaty. The treaties of Aigun, Tientsin and Peking were concluded under such circumstances. Where was the so-called "peace," "consultation" and "friendliness and neighborliness"? Discussing the Sino-Russian "treaty of Tientsin," the book says that the treaty agreed to "extend to Russia the rights and privileges already enjoyed by or may be accorded to the other powers, including the right to trade at open ports." Since "all the rights and privileges already enjoyed by or may be accorded to the other Western powers" were wholly "extended" to Russia, does that not show that at that time -- the mid-19th century -- tsarist Russia and Britain, France and the United States were birds of a feather? With regard to Sino-Russian trade, after the signing in 1851 of the "Ili-Tarbagatai Trade Regulations," which exempted Russian merchants from payment of trade duties at Ili and Tarbagatai, trade between the two countries had an unequal character. Later, Russia also obtained the special privilege of reduced duties for overland trade, which cut import duties by one-third so the Russians had to pay only two-thirds of the tariff. China, bound by an unequal customs agreement, for a long time could impose a duty of only 5 percent ad valorem on imports. Marx pointed out in the 1850's that China's customs duties were the lowest in the world. Yet tsarist Russia still demanded a reduction. It shows how greedy it was. It should also be pointed out that reduction of duties on overland trade was enjoyed only by Russia at that time. It was later, after their occupation of Vietnam and Burma respectively, that France and Britain demanded the same privileges in accordance with the Russian precedent. This is yet another point of true "difference" between tsarist Russia and the Western powers, only this "difference" is not what the authors meant. Their purpose is to add a coat of paint with the "difference" on tsarist Russia's policy of "friendliness and neighborliness," but it turns out that this proves that tsarist Russia's aggressiveness was even more treacherous in certain respects.

To make people believe in their view of "difference," Tikhvinskiy and company also make fabrications freely about a series of concrete questions in Sino-Russian relations. For example, they claim that "Russia did not export opium to China nor import coolies from China nor use missionaries as spies for commercial expansion," etc. All this is "there is no 300 taels of silver here," a tactic of self-deception and fraud. As a matter of fact, there are records of tsarist Russia's peddling of opium and espionage by Russian missionaries, while its carrying away to Russia of large numbers of inhabitants of Chinese frontier areas by deception and force was comparable to the abduction and selling of Chinese laborers by Western countries. These Soviet revisionist gentlemen are really original in their method of writing

history. They do not write about the innumerable things in Sino-Russian relations that actually happened, but are eager to claim that this and that "did not exist." Since these things "did not happen" in history, why bother to write about them in a history at all? The truth is that they want to proclaim, by comparing tsarist Russian conduct with that of the Western powers, that tsarist Russia was not an aggressor in China, but a "peaceful," "friendly and neighborly" friend. They cannot deceive anyone. The aggressive nature of Russia is no different from that of the Western powers of Britain, the United States and France. If there is any difference at all, it is that tsarist Russia obtained more rights and privileges and seized more territory from China than the Western powers.

Eighth, toward the end of the 19th century and early in the 20th, tsarist Russia, like the other capitalist powers, developed to the stage of imperialism. While violently struggling for world domination, the imperialist powers also developed a struggle to partition China. They scrambled for their own spheres of influence, leased territories and various concessions and special privileges. Tsarist Russia, which had extremely greedy territorial designs on our vast frontier regions, hoped to take possession of our Northeast, Mongolia, Sinkiang and Tibet. Tsarist Russia's minister of the army Kropotkin wrote in his diary in 1903: "I told Witte (维特) that our Tsar had a grand plan in his head: to seize Manchuria for Russia, annex Korea, and incorporate Tibet in our country."* Finance Minister Witte also stated that the area of China in which Russia planned to expand "includes that from the Pacific coast to the peaks of the Himalayas."** The old tsars really acted according to this plan. Tsarist Russia employed all means -- military, political, economic -- in dealing with China. It even bought off officials of the Manchu government and incited the feudal upper-level rulers of the frontier regions to engage in secessionist activities. In fact there was nothing it would not do to achieve this end. In its relations with the other imperialism it formed alliances to suit its needs, sometimes struggling or even going to war with one another and sometimes conspiring with one another to share the loot. All this fully demonstrated its cruel, sly nature. But Tikhvinskiy and company, glossing over things by means of oversimplification and concealment of facts, fundamentally cover up the whole truth of tsarist Russian aggression against China during that period. They even make aggression look like progress in singing the praises of the old tsars.

It was clearly tsarist Russia which struggled with Japan for seizure of China's Northeast regions, but Tikhvinskiy and company depict Russia's intervention in cooperation with France and Germany and their forcing Japan

---

* "Kropotkin's Diary," carried in Soviet Russian magazine Red Archive, Vol. II, 1922, p. 31.

** Maihara (麦哈拉), "Tibet and the Russian Conspiracy," carried in British Royal Central Asia Magazine, No. 1, 1958.

to return Liaotung peninsula to China as Russian "support" for China. It was clearly tsarist Russia which struggled with Britain for domination of China's Tibet, but Tikhvinskiy and company claim that "opposition by tsarist Russia" made it "possible" for the Manchu government to refuse to recognize the "Anglo-Tibetan treaty" and subsequently to revise it. More outrageous still, they actually applaud the old tsars for their ugly deeds of violating China's sovereignty and intervention in China's internal affairs. Commenting on the "Russo-Mongolian agreement" concluded between tsarist Russia and Outer Mongolian feudal lords in November 1912 which separated Outer Mongolia from China, they write in the book: "Realization of Mongolian autonomy, though brought about under circumstances of inequality with and dependence on the tsarist Russian government, nevertheless enabled the Mongolian people to establish closer liaison with Russia, the vanguard of international revolutionary movement. It promoted the propagation in Mongolia of the advanced ideas of democracy, socialism and friendly cooperation between various nationalities.... Objectively speaking, this was a progressive phenomenon in the history of the Mongolian people." Here, thanks to the miraculous pen of hireling writers of the Soviet revisionists, the Mongolian feudal lords who leaned on the old tsars suddenly became "the Mongolian people," imperialist Russia was suddenly metamorphosed into "Russia, the vanguard of international revolutionary movement," and so tsarist Russia's divisive activities "objectively" "played a progressive role." According to this, the deeper the dependence on the old tsars, "objectively" the stronger must be the "progressive character," and utter dependence must be utter "progress"! Dear sirs, the Russia which you paint was not "Russia, the vanguard of international revolutionary movement," but imperialist Russia which Lenin angrily called "the gendarme of Europe" and "gendarme of Asia." You are actually despicable enough to prettify the old tsars by stealing the name of vanguard of international revolutionary movement! Even as a representative of the old tsar and the Mongolian feudal lords furtively signed in a dark corner in November 1912 the "Russo-Mongolian agreement" which you so admire, Lenin once and again made a just call, relentlessly thrashing the old tsar's crime of intervention in Outer Mongolia and splitting China. Lenin satirized and rebuked Russia for having "closely embraced" Mongolia and its plan to swallow this piece of "juicy meat" of China. ("Newborn China") He declared sternly and righteously: "The Social Democrat Party group of the 4th State Duma specially oppose the foreign policy of the Russian government. It severely rebukes our country's attempt to expand its territory by forcibly occupying other people's land in the Strait of Bosporus, Turkish Armenia, Persia and China, as well as our forcible occupation of Mongolia, an act that undermines our friendly relations with our great fraternal state, the Republic of China." ("Question of Workers' Representation in the Duma and Their Declaration") That was the voice of Lenin, the voice of a true vanguard of international revolutionary movement. Gentlemen, if you still have some courage left, please compare this with the words printed in black and white in your book. It is quite proper to call you, renegades of Marxism-Leninism, defenders of the old tsars.

It may be seen from the foregoing that the book praises revisionism everywhere and points the spearhead viciously at Marxism-Leninism and at Mao Tsetung Thought. For half a century Chairman Mao, on the basis of his

Marxist-Leninist analysis of Chinese history, determined the character, mission, line and strategy of the Chinese revolution and led the Chinese people to great victory in the revolution. Mao Tsetung Thought is a union of Marxism-Leninism with the practice of the Chinese revolution, a powerful ideological weapon directing China's new democratic revolution to victory, and one that directs our people to victory in socialist revolution and socialist construction under proletarian dictatorhsip. But a unified, strong socialist China is an insurmountable, great obstacle to the Soviet revisionist new tsars' external aggressive expansion and winning of world hegemony. No wonder Nikifurov, who knows perfectly the inside details of the book, says: "Owing to the exposure of the gradual degeneration of the Chinese leadership to a bourgeois nationalistic stand (note: this should read: the Chinese Communists hold high the banner of Marxism-Leninism and firmly maintain the proletarian internationalist stand), it is necessary to analyze again the actual condition of China and China's development in the past." "China and Chinese history have become an object of sharp ideological struggle."* Nothing can be clearer. Tampering with China's past is done in order to distort China's revolution and reality and to prove the Chinese "bourgeois nationalistic stand" which they have fabricated, so as to hoodwink the people of the Soviet Union and the world. The authors of this book have taken great pains to negate Chairman Mao's series of scientific conclusions concerning the modern history of China because they want to negate collaterally the Marxist-Leninist line formulated by Chairman Mao for the Chinese revolution. They hope wildly to stop the Chinese people from marching forward triumphantly along the socialist road under the guidance Mao Tsetung Thought.

The falsification and alteration of China's modern history and Sino-Russian relations by Tikhvinskiy and company is a self-manifestation of the Soviet modern revisionist ideological system as well as a confession of the revisionists' promotion of the doctrine of superpower hegemony. In their China's Modern History Tikhvinskiy and company hold up the banner of research into modern Chinese history but in reality focus their attention on today's reality. Every erroneous view in the book that puts history upside down clearly shows the attempt of Soviet revisionist new tsars to put out the flames of the anti-imperialist, anti-colonial and anti-hegemonic struggle of the third world countries and people, and their wild ambition to become the No. 1 master of the world. Their praise of the "national principle" with which the old tsars divided other countries proves that the Soviet revisionists are following the old method of divide-and-rule in dismembering and splitting other countries in their attempt to establish a tsarist-style colonial empire. The defense they put forward for the old tsars' annexation of Chinese territory shows not only the plan of the Soviet revisionists to occupy permanently and further seize Chinese territory in

---

* Nikifurov's "Book Review" quoted above.

order to accomplish the "unfinished task" of the old tsars, but also the hope to find some historical basis for their policy of worldwide territorial expansion. They accuse others of being "chauvinists" in order to cover up their own doctrine of hegemony and the truth that their country has become the most dangerous source of a new world war of the present time, and at the same time suppress the anti-hegemony struggle of the people of all countries. They give the old tsars' policy of aggression against China the euphemistic name of "friendliness and neighborliness," but it exactly reflects the new tsars' aggression against, intervention in, and control, subversion and plunder of other countries under the cover of "natural friends," "selfless help," and other pleasant sounding words. They label the old tsars with the sign of "progressiveness" exactly in order to gild the "big family" which the new tsars control and which gains profit at other people's expense and specializes in exploiting and enslaving other people. They expound the "difference" between tsarist Russia and the Western powers in order to show that the two superpowers, the Soviet Union and the United States, cannot be mentioned in the same breath. The "expansion is justified" which they propagandize is closely linked to the so-called "Brezhnev doctrine" and things like that. They write in their book the name of tsarist Russian imperialism, but hidden in the whole work is the soul of Soviet revisionist social-imperialism. Therefore, it is a written defense of tsarist Russian colonialism as well as a confession of Soviet revisionist doctrine of hegemony.

Speaking of the pseudo-science of the bourgeoisie, Marx pointed out 100 years ago: "The question is no longer whether this or that principle is correct, but whether it is profitable or harmful, advantageous or disadvantageous to capital, whether it violates or does not violate police regulations. Unbiased research has yielded its place to struggle by hired literary mendicants. Impartial, selfless scientific exploration has yielded its place to the evil mind and ill intention of apologists." ("Postscript to 2nd Edition of Capital") The Soviet revisionist science of historiography as represented by Tikhvinskiy and company must also be viewed in this light.

Since the Soviet revisionist renegade group assumed power, the Soviet Union has degenerated from being a socialist country into a social-imperialist country, and its science of historiography has become completely an exclusive instrument of the bureaucratic monopoly bourgeoisie. Owing to the decadent character of such social imperialism, modern revisionism as its theoretical basis can no longer play any new trick and its science of historiography, directed by this modern revisionism, can only pass the day by fabricating lies and peddling the mildewed goods of old-time imperialism, thus steadily degenerating to a point beyond salvage.

As the bourgeoisie has turned all science of historiography into a commodity, falsification and alteration of China's modern history and the history of Sino-Russian relations, encouraged and lucratively rewarded by a small handful of monopoly oligarchs, has become a popular subject of the enslaved science of historiography of the Soviet revisionists. All -- from officials of the Soviet revisionist government to "scholars" with academic titles -- throw themselves into this ignoble activity. They either openly

oppose the scientific conclusions of the teachers of revolution, or, slapping themselves in the face, recantingly call what truths they have said before "lies fabricated out of thin air." Of these slaves who have sold their own souls, the most outstanding one in recent years is probably this Tikhvinskiy. In reality he is only a dilettante, but gains the favor of his masters by dint of creating public opinion favorable to the Soviet revisionists' efforts to oppose China and win world hegemony.

Commenting on this book, one Soviet revisionist writer says that it "sums up the result of 15 years' research."* This is partly true. It has really collected the reactionary views attacking and slandering the Chinese people since the assumption of power of the Soviet revisionist renegade group as well as the innumerably flawed falsifications and alterations made by Soviet revisionist historiographers, and given them concentrated expression. This is what is meant by the so-called "result of research."

Another Soviet revisionist writer says in his comment that this is not only "a necessary and helpful specialized work, but also a book of great significance."** This too is partially true. It is "necessary and helpful" not only because the Soviet revisionist new tsars need such a big poisonous weed to create public opinion for them, and not only because the reactionary decadent forces need such a big poisonous weed so they may extract venom from it for use as a stimulant, but also because the people of the world, including the people of the Soviet Union, need such a textbook of negative examples to see what Soviet revisionism and its hireling science of historiography are like, and see further the ugly demeanor of the new tsars so as to heighten their vigilance. Seen from this angle, the book is really of "great significance." For this reason we ought to thank the authors of this "masterpiece" -- the literary mendicants fed by the new tsars. Our return gift to them is this: criticism, and again criticism.

* * *

---

* Ibid.

** Miyasnikov (米亚斯尼科夫), "The Rise and Decline of the Manchu Empire," carried in Soviet magazine Far East Problems, No. 3, 1973.

Tsarist Russia's Aggressive Expansion Against the Balkans

by

Shih Ping (史兵) and Pao Pin (葆斌)

(Li-shih Yen-chiu /Historical Research/, No. 6, December 20, 1975)

Since recent years a chorus of voices has been coming from Moscow praising the old tsars and defending their criminal acts of aggressive expansion against the Balkans. Some speak laudatorily, "Russia exerted an objective, progressive and positive influence on the historical development of the Balkan peoples and on their struggle for national liberation."* Some say that in the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-1878, "victory of the Russian Army insured the independence of Romania, Serbia and Montenegro"** "and insured the liberation of Bulgaria from enslavement by the Osmanli."*** And so on and so forth. About the acts of the old tsars in the Balkans, a conclusion was reached long ago by the proletarian revolutionary teachers. Engels clearly called the "liberation" lauded by tsarist Russia "tsarist-style liberation"+ and "aggression under the banner of liberation."++ Words express the innermost feelings. The vociferation of the Soviet revisionist renegade group is certainly not made merely to show their nostalgic thoughts, but to defend today's ignoble acts with those of yesterday. A look back at the history of tsarist Russia's aggressive expansion against the Balkans, an uncovering of its past deeds and a look at the reality of the new tsar's scramble for the Balkans would be helpful to further understanding the reactionary essential nature of Soviet revisionist social imperialism.

(I)

The Balkan Peninsula, situated at the strategic crossroads of Europe, Asia and Africa, is Europe's southeastern gateway. The Bosporus and Dardanelles straits at the southeastern tip of the peninsula in

---

* Institute of Slavology and Balkanology, the Soviet Academy of Sciences, International Relations of the Balkans, 1974, p. 38.

** Concise Encyclopedia of USSR, Vol. VIII, 1960, p. 69.

*** Grand Encyclopedia of USSR, 3rd Ed., Vol. III, 1970, p. 480.

\+ "Foreign Policy of Tsarist Government of Russia," Complete Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. XXII, p. 51.

++ Ibid., p. 20.

particular form the vital outlet from the Black Sea to the Mediterranean. They are in an extraordinarily important strategic position.

Historically the Balkan Peninsula included Albania, two principalities on the Danube--Moldavia and Walachia* (now part of Romania), Serbia, Montenegro, Bosnia, Hercegovina (both now part of Yugoslavia), Bulgaria, and Greece. Most of the population are adherents of the Eastern Orthodox Church. The Serbians and Bulgars are Southern Slavs. Around the 15th century the Ottoman Empire established by the Turks conquered the Balkan states. The barbaric rule of the Turks on the Balkans, which lasted for five centuries, brought endless misery to the peoples of the region. To resist the brutal exploitation and oppression of the Turkish rulers, the Balkan peoples fought courageously for a long time.

In modern history the Balkan Peninsula was an area the possession of which was violently fought for between tsarist Russia and the European powers. With the steady decline of the Ottoman Empire the struggle among the powers for the "Osmanli legacy" and to partition the Balkans became more and more violent. Under the banner of maintaining the "integrity" of the Ottoman Empire, Britain attempted to control the Balkans to safeguard her interests in the Middle and Near East and her position as the ruler of the seas. France, who had extensive economic interests in the Middle and Near East, wanted likewise to control the Balkans and its two straits. Austria continually carried out expansion from the northwest toward the western part of the Balkans and the lower reaches of the Danube. Of the powers who fought for possession of the Balkans, tsarist Russia had the greatest designs and was the first to act.

To realize its wild designs of achieving world hegemony, tsarist Russia early made it a target to seize Constantinople as a bridgehead for its drive to the Balkans. Ever since the first tsar, Moscow's rulers have considered themselves successors to the Eastern Roman Empire and showed their avid ambition of grabbing the legacy of that empire. Tsar "Peter I had already planned to place his throne on the ruins of Turkey"** and for this purpose started a war against Turkey several times. Following tsarist Russia's drive toward the south and the Balkans, Tsarina Catherine II formulated her notorious "Greek Project," preparing to drive Turkey out of Europe and establish a "Greek Empire" to be ruled by her grandson. This shows that with the quickening tempo of its external expansion, the appetite of tsarist Russia became more and more voracious. It wanted to occupy not only Constantinople and solely

---

* The two principalities were united in 1859, and renamed Kingdom of Romania in 1862.

** "The Turkish Question--Times--Russia's Expansion," Complete Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. IX, p. 130.

dominate the two straits, but also the whole Balkan Peninsula, so it might enter the Mediterranean, push its frontier to the Adriatic Sea and threaten the heart of Europe from the southern flank.

The principal means by which tsarist Russia realized this expansion program was naked armed aggression. By waging war against Turkey again and again, it seized one piece of Turkish territory after another. Through two large-scale wars (1768-1774, 1787-1791) started by Catherine II alone, Russia seized a large piece of maritime area on the north shore of the Black Sea. There it introduced the evil system of serfdom. Thus it pushed its western frontier from the Dnieper to the Dniester, ringing up the curtain on its direct invasion of the Balkan Peninsula. Russian nobles and landlords, overjoyed at the "fruits of war" of the aggression of Catherine II, praised her as the "Empress of the Nobles." A court poet was moved to write: "March forward in big strides, and the whole world is yours."*

Of course, while it "marched forward in big strides" toward the Balkans, tsarist Russia would not neglect to put on pretty clothes of all kinds to cover up its acts of aggression. in the struggle of the Balkan peoples in opposition to Turkish rule and for liberation, it constantly held up the banner of "Liberation of our Slav brothers" and "Protection of followers of the Orthodox Church," and intervened in the affairs of the Balkans so as to attain its object of expansion. But it was tsarist Russia, which assumed the role of "Liberator" and "Protector," who carried out brutal military aggression, cruel economic exploitation and frenzied political oppression against the two principalities on the Danube, Serbia, Bulgaria and others, committing the gravest crimes against the Balkan peoples. Innumerable historical facts of the Balkans show that tsarist Russia, which covered up its acts of aggression by deceptive means, was the ferocious enemy of the Balkan peoples.

(II)

After the Vienna Conference of 1815 tsarist Russia, on account of its position as the dominant power in Europe, became more and more extravagant in its aggressive expansion against the Balkans. This led to struggle with the Western powers of Britain, France and Austria, producing prolonged unrestlessness in the Balkan region. In its struggle with the Western powers, tsarist Russia strove energetically to exploit the steadily rising national liberation movement of the Balkan peoples as part of its hegemonic policy.

In 1828-29 Tsar Nicholas I, taking advantage of the fact that Turkey was sorely tried by Greek uprisings and under the pretext of

---

* G.R. Derzhavin: "Hymn To Occupation of Warsaw," see Complete Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. X, p. 334.

protecting adherents of the Eastern Orthodox Church, started a war against Turkey, forcing it to sign the "treaty of Adrianople," annexing the estuary of the Danube and the nearby islands, and turning the two principalities of the Danube into his "protectorates" occupied by the Russian army. These two principalities lay in the way of Russia's drive toward the straits and the Adriatic Sea, and were known as the granary of the Balkans. Annexation of the two principalities had been the target of the tsars since Peter I. In 1812, Tsar Alexander I already annexed Bessarabia, part of the two principalities, through a war with Turkey. Now, having placed the two principalities under its protection, tsarist Russia took another step toward the objective of annexation of the two principalities. Having occupied these two principalities, tsarist Russian troops brutally ruled and enslaved the population. Over 30,000 Romanians were dragged away from their fields to serve as draft animals by pulling Russian cannons and chariots. Those who fled to the mountains had to feed on tree bark and grass roots. Countless people perished in this way.

To tighten its control on the two principalities, tsarist Russia imposed on their people an "organizational regulations (Reglement Organique)"--the equivalent to a constitution--in 1831 and 1832. The "regulations" not only increased the number of days of requisitioned labor for the peasants, but moreover imposed innumerable exorbitant taxes and levies on them, including a "poll tax" and "tax on driving a carriage to town." The people had to play a toll even on the roads and bridges which they themselves had built. The peasants were permanently tied to the land so they became serfs without any personal freedom. Those who resisted were thrown into prison or beheaded.

Where there is oppression, there will be resistance. The atrocious acts of tsarist Russian troops produced in the people of the two principalities a deep hatred for the tsarist system. Thus, when the storm of the 1848 revolution swept the European continent, the fiery hatred of the people for the tsarist invader, long smoldering in their hearts, burst out like the eruption of a volcano. They burned the "organizational regulations," seized the land that had been theirs and drove away the government officials, dealing a severe blow to and shaking the reactionary rule of tsarist Russia and its running dogs. Marx pointed out profoundly that the revolution was "a resistance movement against the Russian protector."*

Faced with the tumultuous revolutionary movement, Nicholas I hurriedly despatched an army of 120,000 men in June 1848, to suppress the revolution in Moldavia. In September he instigated Turkey to send an army to quell the revolution in Walachia. When the atrocities of the Turkish troops brought forth resistance from the local people, tsarist

---

* "Notes on the Romanians," 1964, Bucharest edition, p. 130.

Russian troops entered Walachia in the role of the "liberator." "All public organs (of Walachia), civil, military and judicial, were illegally seized and controlled by the Russian military.... All revolutionaries--those who opposed the Russians--were put under arrest...."* The tempestuous revolutionary movement in the two principalities were finally submerged in a bloodbath brought about by tsarist Russia.

That was not the only time in history the Romanian people were brutally trampled by tsarist Russia. As a staging point for tsarist Russian armies in their attack on Turkey, the two principalities were occupied by tsarist Russia no less than 6 or 7 times. The ample food stock here could supply the tsarist Russian troops with provisions, and the money raised here through exorbitant taxation could provide funds for the invaders. These historical facts fully attested to the truth of this brilliant assertion of Marx: "Since Peter the Great, destruction of the Romanian nation has always been the object of Russian schemes and wars."**

Tsarist Russia's control of the two Danubian principalities in the 20's through 40's of the 19th century strengthened its position in the fight for domination over the Balkans and encouraged its ambition to seize the straits. In 1833, taking advantage of Turkey's defeat at the hands of Egypt, its vassal state, tsarist Russia voluntarily offered "military aid" to the Turkish sultan. The sultan of Turkey, then in imminent danger of collapse, could do no better than let the wolf into his house. He said, "When a man falls in the water and sees a snake in front of him, he would grasp it just to avoid being drowned."*** The venomous serpent of tsarist Russia was of course not the straw that would save the Turkish sultan's life. It despatched a large army to Constantinople and controlled the Bosporus, forcing Turkey to sign the treaty of "Unkiar-Skelessi" and in effect putting Turkey under the exclusive "protection" of Russia. Secret clauses in the treaty stipulated that Turkey must close the Dardanelles and not permit any single foreign warship to enter the strait under any pretext, while Russian fleets could pass through it freely. In this way Turkey became Russia's watchman of the strait and the Black Sea became a Russian lake. Tsarist Russia finally realized the object of exclusive domination of the strait which it had sought even in its dreams.

The rapid expansion of tsarist Russian influence in the Balkans greatly alarmed Britain and France. The two powers despatched powerful naval fleets to patrol the Mediterranean, and there was sudden tension

---

* Ibid., p. 177.

** "The Eastern Question," Complete Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. XII, p. 279.

*** Requoted from "History of World Diplomacy" ed. by Bouchumkin (鮑爾姆金), Vol. II, Chinese edition of 1950, p. 126.

between Russia and the two powers. In 1839 a war again broke out between Turkey and Egypt. Russia was eager to intervene again in order to further enlarge its influence. Britain, unable to tolerate Russia's exclusive gobbling up of Turkey, allied herself to Austria and others in a common effort to resist Russia. War clouds suddenly gathered over the region of the straits. In July 1840, under the pressure of joint action by the Western states, tsarist Russia was forced to sign an agreement with Britain, Austria and Prussia in London, by which "joint protection" of Turkey by these states replaced "exclusive protection" by Russia. Then a London pact was again signed in 1841, which forbade warships of any nation to pass the straits. Tsarist Russia's ambition of exclusive domination of the straits met with serious setback.

While fighting for the straits, tsarist Russia also fought desperately with other powers on the Balkan Peninsula itself and particularly in Serbia. Under the banner of "support for national liberation," it stretched its fiendish claws into Serbia from the early years of the 19th century in an attempt to make this a base from which to open a route from the Adriatic Sea to the Mediterranean. Through the "Akkerman Convention" of 1826 and the "Adrianople treaty" of 1829, tsarist Russia forced Turkey to recognize its right as protector of Serbia, greatly strengthening its influence in Serbia. But from the middle of the 30's British influence also entered Serbia, while in order to find a way out to the Adriatic Sea Austria also tried to control Serbia. Under these circumstances Tsar Nicholas I, ceaselessly taking advantage of Serbian internal contradictions, further intervened in Serbia's internal affairs. In 1839 he instigated the Serbian opposition to depose Prince Milosh, who had demonstrated increasingly great independence from tsarist Russian control. In 1842, by organizing a riot, it made another prince, Michael, a sacrifice to Peterburg's schemes. By using and manipulating the election of a prince of Serbia in 1842, it also tried to have a pro-Russian element elected to the throne. But by courageous patriotic action the Serbian people broke through the control of the tsarist Russian interventionists and elected Alexander Karageorgevic the prince of Serbia. After that, tsarist Russia resorted to such devilish tricks as armed threats, espionage, and organized subversion, rudely interfering in the internal affairs of Serbia. It forced the prince to dismiss many anti-Russian ministers and military officers in an attempt to set up a pro-Russian puppet regime. At the same time, the tsarist government occasionally baited the Serbians, hinting that under Russian protection, there was hope that the territory of Serbia could be enlarged and all Serbians under the rule of Turkey and Austria could be united to form a kingdom of their own. At other times it would threaten to send a grand army to Serbia to subjugate the country completely if the people dared to resist.* The ignoble acts of tsarist Russia,

---

* See "War in the East," Complete Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. X, p. 26.

alternately soft and tough, tore off the mask of the "protector" and revealed the grim aspect of the aggressor in front of the Serbian people.

The wild designs of tsarist Russia on the Balkans met with repeated setbacks owing to the resistance of the Balkan peoples and the obstruction of the other powers, but it did not give up. Once more it adopted the tactic of retreating in order to advance. It tried to attain the predetermined objective of occupation of the two straits by partitioning Turkey with Britain. In 1844 Nicholas I went all the way to London to negotiate an odious transaction with Britain to partition Turkey. He planned to give Egypt and Candia (now Crete) to Britain, while keeping the two Danubian principalities, Serbia and Bulgaria as Russian vassal states. Constantinople was also to be occupied by the Russians. Nicholas I also did everything he could to sow dissension between Britain and France and aggravate Franco-British contradictions in Egypt and the Mediterranean, so as to facilitate Russia's occupation of the two straits. But conflict of interests between Russia and Britain made an agreement impossible, and the odious deal fell through.

Owing to new developments of capitalism in Britain, France and others in mid-19th century, the struggle among the powers for markets became more and more intense. Development of capitalism in Russia at the time was seriously hampered by the feudal system of serfdom which was in a ruling position. Class contradictions and national contradictions were extremely acute, and peasant risings continually occurred. To divert the attention of the people from affairs at home and shake off the steadily aggravating domestic crisis, the tsarist government decided to stake everything on war, in a vain attempt to realize by this means the traditional ambition of exclusive occupation of the two straits and annexation of the Balkans.

In 1853, holding up the banner of "protect the followers of the Orthodox Church," tsarist Russia provocatively demanded Turkey to hand over Palestine to the control of followers of the Orthodox Church and recognize Russia's right to protect these followers in Turkish territory. With the support of Britain and France, Turkey rejected the demand. Thereupon Russian troops were moved into the two Danubian principalities and a Russo-Turkish war erupted. Just as the Russian armies defeated the Turks and were arrogantly approaching Constantinople, Britain and France declared war on Russia in March 1854. This war between tsarist Russia on the one side and Britain and France on the other--known as the Crimean War--lasted two years and ended in the defeat of tsarist Russia. To both tsarist Russia and the Anglo-French side of the conflict, the Crimean War was an unjust war of aggression. To the countries in the theater of war--the two Danubian principalities and Bulgaria--it was a disaster. On account of its defeat, tsarist Russia was forced to give up its protectorship over the two principalities. In accordance with the "treaty of Paris" signed in March 1856, tsarist Russia was deprived of the right to maintain a fleet in the Black Sea and build fortresses and arsenals there. It also had to return to the two principalities the southern part of Bessarabia, which it occupied in 1812.

The Crimean War dealt a heavy blow to tsarist Russia's wild ambition of exclusive occupation of the two straits and the Balkans. The defeat utterly exposed the backwardness and corruption of tsarist Russia under the system of serfdom. Its ambitions were great, but without sufficient strength in support. It was unable to suppress the courageous resistance of the Balkan peoples. Nor could it compete with the other capitalist powers. Its defeat was inevitable.

(III)

After the Crimean War tsarist Russia reformed the system of serfdom. Capitalism began to develop rapidly, and the demand for foreign markets became increasingly urgent. The Balkans, especially the two straits, remained the main objective of tsarist Russia's aggressive expansion. To shake off the restrictions of the treaty of Paris, tsarist Russia exploited the contradictions of the major powers, kept an eye on the main trend of affairs and bided its time, with the intention of coming back. Russian foreign minister Gorchakov said, "Russia is not angry. It is amassing strength."* Indeed, the Franco-Prussian war that broke out in 1870 gave tsarist Russia the opportunity it had long been waiting for. Tsarist Russia and Prussia made use of each other to their mutual advantage. With Prussian support, tsarist Russia abrogated that part of the Paris treaty forbidding Russia to keep a fleet in the Black Sea and quickly restored its military strength in the Black Sea, preparing conditions for further expansion.

In the second half of the 19th century, following the further decline of the already effete Ottoman Empire and the development of capitalism in the Balkans, the Balkan national liberation movement entered a period of upsurge. In 1875-76 the people of Bosnia, Hercegovina and Bulgaria rose one after another to oppose Turkish oppression and fight for national independence. At the same time, Serbia and Montenegro also joined in the war against Turkey one after the other. Seeing the opportunity, tsarist Russia, who had been waiting for it, yelled the slogan, "Help our Slav brothers," and again carried out aggressive expansion against the Balkans on a large scale. In April 1877 it again launched a war against Turkey. Russian troops forced the Danube, occupied Bulgaria, and directly threatened Constantinople, forcing Turkey to sign the "treaty of San Stefano." The main content of the treaty was a stipulation that Greater Bulgaria--a protectorate under Russian control--was to be established. According to the provisions of the treaty, the frontiers of Bulgaria were greatly extended. A large area on the north shore of the Aegean Sea (including a large part of Macedonia) was incorporated into Greater Bulgaria. From early in the 70's of the 19th

---

* Requoted from "Foreign Policy of Tsarist Government of Russia," Complete Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. XXII, p. 45.

century tsarist Russia began to work on Bulgaria with the utmost energy, the purpose being to make it a base from which to take the straits and a bridgehead by which to enter the Mediterranean. The Greater Bulgaria plan fully revealed this purpose. As soon as the treaty of San Stefano was out, it was unanimously opposed by the Western powers. Britain even moved her warships into the Sea of Marmara and declared that if tsarist Russia refused to review the treaty, she would fight it. Tsarist Russia, afraid of being alone and defeated again as it had been in the Crimea, could not but accept the revisions to the San Stefano treaty made by the powers at the Berlin congress in 1878. It was forced to surrender some of the loot already in its hands and reduce the territory of Greater Bulgaria to one-third. Tsarist Russia's expansionist designs met with setback at the congress of Berlin, but Russia nevertheless partially realized its object of aggression. Through its control of Bulgaria it strengthened its position in the Balkans and again annexed the southern part of Romania's Bessarabia.

After the congress of Berlin, Bulgaria won independence from Turkish rule, but fell into the devilish hands of tsarist Russia. A large number of Russian civilian and military officials swarmed into Sofia. Russians filled all important cabinet posts in the government and took command of the army from the company level upward. Even the king, Alexander of Battenberg, was a nephew of Tsar Alexander II. The Russians controlled the state machinery of Bulgaria from the upper to the lower levels and monopolized in a patriarchal manner all internal and external affairs of Bulgaria. Later, tsarist Russia demanded the Bulgarian government to build a railway from the Danube (i.e., Ruse or Svezitov 斯维兹勃托夫) to Sofia, so as to join together the railway from Russia to Bulgaria through Romania, and so that in the event of war, tsarist Russia might be able to send its troops quickly to Constantinople. In addition, tsarist Russia forced the Bulgarian people to pay for the cost of Russian military occupation. After the union of Bulgaria with Eastern Rumelia in 1885,* Bulgaria had to pay for the cost of Russian occupation of Eastern Rumelia too. These costs amounted to more than fr56,000,000, which the Bulgarian people still had to pay during World War I. Regarding the arrogance and acts of extortion of tsarist Russia, even tame king Battenburg had this to say: "If the Russians carry on in this way, they will become the most hated people in Bulgaria in the next few years."**

---

* In accordance with the Berlin treaty of 1878, the Bulgarian region south of the Balkan Mountains became the Ottoman empire's Eastern Rumelia Province. It was merged with Bulgaria in 1885.

** Googe (古奇): "Modern History of Europe, 1878-1919," London edition of 1924, p. 5.

Tsarist Russia's tyranny and outrageous behavior roused the Bulgarian people to extreme indignation and wrath. Even the bourgeoisie put forward the slogan: "Bulgaria is the Bulgaria to the Bulgars!" In spite of all sorts of obstruction by tsarist Russia, the people of Bulgaria and Eastern Rumelia brought about a union of the two states in 1885, thus accomplishing their national unification. Fearing that the unification and independence of Bulgaria might jeopardize its colonial rule, tsarist Russia applied pressure on Bulgaria by recalling all Russian military officers from Bulgaria in an attempt to force Bulgaria to submit to its rule. After this scheme failed, it organized pro-Russian elements for a coup d'etat in August 1886, and had Battenburg abducted and taken out of Bulgaria. Later, it sent a Russian general to restore Russian rule in Bulgaria. But "the Bulgarian people had already had enough of the tsarist-style liberation from the activities of agents of the tsar sent to their country."* The Bulgarian regents who acted for the king rejected the unreasonable demands of the tsar's envoy. Under the circumstances, the tsar's envoy could only pack up and leave unceremoniously. In November 1886 tsarist Russia again threatened to break off diplomatic relations with Bulgaria. But united and undaunted, the Bulgarian people finally shook off tsarist Russia's intervention and control by relying on their own effort.

Toward the end of the 19th century and early in the 20th century, capitalism developed into the stage of imperialism. The several major imperialist powers had already completed the division of the world into their respective spheres of influence. In the struggle to redivide the world, tsarist Russian military feudal imperialism, in which monopoly capital and feudal vestiges were combined, was particularly aggressive. At that time the Balkan Peninsula and the Black Sea straits were still one of the important objects of tsarist Russian expansion. Tsar Nicholas II declared, "Don't ignore the East, but direct the greatest attention to the West."** His Army Secretary put it even more specifically: "Our Tsar has a gigantic plan in his head....to occupy not only Bosporus, but also Dardanelles."*** But this time it was not only Britain, tsarist Russia's old adversary, who faced it in the struggle for the Balkans. Germany, a new imperialist power, now became tsarist Russia's new adversary in the struggle for mastery of the Balkan region.

To fight for world hegemony, Germany also intensified its infiltration into and expansion against the Balkans. In 1898 German

---

* "Foreign Policy of Tsarist Government of Russia," Complete Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. XXII, p. 51.

** "Red Archive" magazine, Vol. II, 1923, p. 20.

*** "Red Archive" magazine, Vol. II, 1922, p. 31.

emperor William II paid a visit to Turkey, and obtained concessions to build a railway from Berlin to Basra via Baghdad. German officers also trained and reorganized the Turkish Army. The rapid rise of German influence in the Balkans became a main obstacle to Russian and British expansion. Accordingly, Russia and Britain conspired to deal jointly with Germany and Austria. As a result of the struggle among the powers in the Balkans and other parts of the world early in the 20th century, two opposing military blocs were formed: Britain, France and Russia on the one side and Germany, Austria and Italy on the other. In their struggle for the Black Sea straits and the Balkans, these two major military blocs constantly interfered in the affairs of the Balkans. They sabotaged once and again the struggle of the Balkan peoples for national independence and, exploiting the territorial disputes between the Balkan states, provoked war among them. Owing to the struggle of these military blocs, the Balkans became the powder keg of Europe. It was here that tsarist Russia, together with other major imperialist powers, ignited the flames of World War I in the summer of 1914. The war led to revolution, and tsarist Russia was finally buried in the flames of revolution. The ambition to seize territory and establish hegemony in the Balkans, long sought after by the old tsars for centuries, went bankrupt.

(IV)

History is a mirror. The struggle of the Soviet revisionists against another superpower for the Balkans today is a continuation of tsarist Russia's struggle with the European powers for the Balkans. The new tsars of the Kremlin, inheriting the mantle of the old tsars, make the struggle for the Balkans an important integral part of their achievement of world hegemony. Calling themselves "Liberator," they have turned a "fraternal" country into a base and bridgehead for aggression against the Balkans, exploiting the people of this country by breaking their bones and sucking their bone marrow. By means of military threats, they demand a sovereign state to give their armed forces the so-called "right of transit" in an attempt to turn the country into a staging area for their forces on their way to the Balkans. They distort history, shamelessly calling Bessarabia, which the old tsars forcibly annexed, their inherent territory. They seize a naval base on the shores of the Adriatic by all conceivable means. They even want to subvert, by ignoble means, the government of a Balkan state which insists on following a policy of independence and self-determination. And so on and so forth. The aggressive expansion of the new tsars threatens the independence and security of the Balkans. The struggle between the two superpowers--the Soviet Union and the United States--is the principal cause of tension in the Balkan region.

The old tsars were very ambitious but lacked sufficient strength. They were harassed internally and externally. Dangers awaited them everywhere. At the end they could not escape from downfall. Today's new tsars are surely in no better position than the old tsars. Their domineering attitude toward the Balkans and their evil deeds there are stirring up

increasingly strong resistance from the people of these countries. The just struggle against domination by another power, now being waged jointly by the people of the Balkan countries, is resolutely supported by the third world and people all over the world. Under this excellent revolutionary situation the new tsars, like the old tsars before them, will surely suffer ignominious defeat and not be able to avoid the fate of downfall.

* * *

END

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Technical Information Service
Springfield, Va. 22161

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

PRINTED MATTER

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
COM-211

U.S. MAIL

CMP X761231 001
UNIV ILLINOIS LIB AT CHICAGO CIRCLE
LIB SERIALS SEC
BOX 8198
CHICAGO IL 60680